

Foreigners and the Urban Economy in Thessalonike, ca. 1150–ca. 1450

DAVID JACOBY

Foreigners and foreignness in Byzantium have lately enjoyed much attention and have been the subject of a growing number of studies.¹ Those considering the activity and presence of foreigners in urban centers generally focus on Constantinople. Foreigners in late Byzantine Thessalonike have hardly been considered in the last century. The first to deal with them was Oreste Tafrali, some ninety years ago, yet he limited himself to some brief remarks.² Freddy Thiriet examined one specific group in the fourteenth century, namely the Venetians.³ Shorter references are found in passing in other publications, such as those dealing with trade. The foreigners in Palaiologan Thessalonike undoubtedly warrant a more thorough investigation. Continuity is an important issue in that context. This is a sufficient reason to reach back to the reign of Manuel I Komnenos and to cover the following three centuries, in order to gain a long-term perspective.

There is no need to elaborate on the importance of Thessalonike as a Byzantine political, economic, and cultural center, second only to Constantinople and, at times in the fourteenth century, possibly even surpassing the capital in intellectual and artistic activity. The city enjoyed a particularly favorable location along the land route and the waterway linking Constantinople to the West. In addition, it served as one of the major outlets of the Balkans to the Aegean and as intermediary between these two regions. It had a rich rural hinterland and was a major market, maritime station, and population center. Yet while geographic factors remained on the whole constant, it was unavoidable that the tumultuous history of Thessalonike after 1204 would have a strong bearing on the city's evolution. More specifically, the fluctuations in political, economic, and social conditions generated

¹ See D. Jacoby, "Les Juifs de Byzance: Une communauté marginalisée," in Ch. A. Maltezou, ed., *Oi περιθωριακοί στο Βυζάντιο* (= Marginality in Byzantium), *Ιδρυμα Γουλανδρή-Χόρν* (Athens, 1993), 103–54, repr. in Jacoby, *Byzantium, Latin Romania and the Mediterranean* (Aldershot, 2001), no. III; A. E. Laiou, "Institutional Mechanisms of Integration," in H. Ahrweiler and A. E. Laiou, eds., *Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire* (Washington, D.C., 1998), 161–81; several essays in D. C. Smythe, ed., *Strangers to Themselves: The Byzantine Outsider*, Papers from the Thirty-Second Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, March 1998 (Aldershot, 2000). Other recent studies are adduced below.

² O. Tafrali, *Thessalonique au quatorzième siècle* (Paris, 1913), 38–44.

³ F. Thiriet, "Les Vénitiens à Thessalonique dans la première moitié du XIV^e siècle," *Byzantion* 22 (1952): 323–32, repr. in idem, *Études sur la Romanie gréco-vénitienne (Xe–XVe siècles)* (London, 1977), no. I.

by successive conquests and civil wars, as well as by various external developments, had a definite impact on the composition, nature, volume, and intensity of foreign activity and presence in the city.

Before entering into the heart of the subject, however, some clarifications are required. First of all, who exactly was a foreigner and, more specifically, who was a foreigner in Thessalonike? The issue is far more complex than it would seem at first sight. To be sure, there were some seemingly objective criteria of foreignness. Foreigners were distinguished by their ethnic or geographic origin, language, religious creed and, moreover, they were not imperial subjects. Yet the boundaries between the latter and foreigners were sometimes blurred. In twelfth-century Constantinople there were Latins who became imperial subjects, and, on the other hand, from the thirteenth century onward we find there Greeks of Orthodox faith, born and residing in the empire, who were subjects of a foreign power such as Venice or Genoa.⁴ One may wonder whether such was also the case in Thessalonike. Other Greeks residing in territories ruled by foreigners were the latter's subjects and thus foreigners once they arrived in the empire, regardless of whether or not they identified with the latter or with their brethren under imperial rule. A case documented in 1367 raises tantalizing questions of identity. A Greek woman who had married the Catalan Pere Estanyol in Thebes and had become a Catholic returned to Orthodoxy after her husband's death fourteen years later, became a nun, and fled to Thessalonike.⁵ Did she consider herself a foreigner in the city, or was she considered as such by others, and for how long? The Jews differed markedly from other groups residing in late Byzantine Thessalonike. As we shall see, they retained their specific individual and collective identity as "foreigners," despite being imperial subjects.

A different ambiguity arises with respect to other residents of Thessalonike in that period. A perusal of the *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit* reveals numerous foreign names and surnames, yet onomastics are a treacherous tool in our context. Christianization, use of the Greek language, service in the army and administration, intermarriage with Greek subjects of the empire, as well as institutional mechanisms such as justice and taxation promoted the integration of foreigners into the social and cultural "melting-pot" of the empire.⁶ We find only a few individuals for whom we have sufficient data to identify them as foreigners. Moreover, we can rarely determine whether or not they maintained their identity as foreigners, which was especially difficult in an urban surrounding unless they were inserted within a specific community. Nor do we know at what point and to what extent they assimilated to their Byzantine surroundings or, in other words, became hellenized. Questions in this respect are even difficult to answer with regard to Yolanda of Montferrat, wife of Emperor Andronikos II, who resided in Thessalonike from 1303 to 1317, since the sources dealing with this empress of Latin origin, known by her Greek name as Eirene, are clouded by political and religious partisanship.⁷ She was clearly the source of the Western values and attitudes of her son Theodore, who after leaving the empire

⁴ For details, see below.

⁵ The case is mentioned in a letter of King Frederick III of Sicily: A. Rubió i Lluch, ed., *Diplomatari de l'Orient català* (Barcelona, 1947), 380–81, no. CCXCII.

⁶ See Laiou, "Mechanisms."

⁷ See D. M. Nicol, *The Byzantine Lady: Ten Portraits, 1250–1500* (Cambridge, 1994), 48–58.

to rule over the marquisate of Montferrat became thoroughly latinized.⁸ Finally, it should also be noted that cultural acculturation did not necessarily entail a change in name or surname, and foreign identity could be concealed by names common in Byzantine and other Christian communities.

The Deblitzenoi family, attested in Thessalonike from 1301 to 1419, offers a case in point. The inconsistent spelling of the surname reveals that it was of foreign origin. The first known member to reside in Thessalonike was Manuel Deblitzenos, the *tzaousios* of the city's cavalry corps in 1301, who by then was a *pronoia*-holder. His son Demetrios remained loyal to the empire when the Serbian czar Stefan Dušan captured eastern Macedonia in 1345, including his property, and he apparently left Thessalonike during the Zealot revolution. During the civil war of 1341–47 he sided with the usurper John Kantakouzenos, remained on good terms with him after the latter's victory, and in 1349 died a monk. His son Manuel was also a military man, an *oikeios* of the emperor, who was firmly integrated by marriage within the social elite of Thessalonike. Presumably in 1381 he gave some land to Docheiariou, an imperial monastery on Mount Athos inhabited by Greek monks.⁹ Nevertheless, a Deblitzenos who apparently was a member of the same family is expressly called "the Serbian" during the last two decades of the fourteenth century.¹⁰ It is impossible to determine whether this was still a subjective perception of foreignness by this individual or a labeling by others.

Even if the foreigner concealed or was unwilling to remember his foreignness, he may have been occasionally reminded of it. Polemics, one of the favorite games in which Byzantine intellectuals indulged, are rife with examples in this respect, and three of them are particularly relevant to our investigation. In 1368 Demetrios Kydones reminded the patriarch of Constantinople Philotheos Kokkinos, born in Thessalonike, of his Jewish origin.¹¹ As for Gregory Palamas, in a letter sent to Philotheos he denigrated his adversaries Barlaam and Gregory Akindynos by stressing their foreign origin, respectively Calabrian and Bulgarian.¹² There is no doubt, however, how these so-called foreigners perceived themselves and were viewed by many others.

The cases considered so far clearly illustrate how problematic it is to deal with indi-

⁸ See A. Laiou, "A Byzantine Prince Latinized: Theodore Palaeologus, Marquis of Montferrat," *Byzantion* 38 (1968): 401–2. On the other hand, M. Dąbrowska, "Family Ethos at the Imperial Court of the Palaiologos in the Light of the Testimony by Theodore of Montferrat," in A. R. Bryzek and M. Salamon, eds., *Byzantina et Slavica Cracoviensia*, vol. 2 (Cracow, 1994), 73–81, minimizes the differences between the West and Byzantium with respect to family values and the Christian code of moral principles, as expressed by Theodore. She is nevertheless aware of the gap between professed ideas and reality.

⁹ See N. Oikonomides, "The Properties of the Deblitzenoi in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," in A. E. Laiou-Thomadakis, ed., *Charanis Studies: Essays in Honor of Peter Charanis* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1980), 176–98; M. Bartusis, "The Settlement of the Serbs in Macedonia in the Era of Dušan's Conquests," in Ahrweiler and Laiou, *Studies* (as above, note 1), 152–53.

¹⁰ P. Schreiner, "Zwei unedierte Praktika aus der zweiten Hälfte des 14. Jh.," *JÖB* 19 (1970): 34.5, and 35 for the dating after 1380; *PLP* 5172.

¹¹ Démétrius Cydonès, *Correspondance*, ed. R.-J. Loenertz (Vatican City, 1956–60), 1: 164–66, letter 129; Demetrios Kydones, *Briefe*, trans. F. Tinnefeld, *Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur* 16 (Stuttgart, 1981–99), 1.2: 393–96, letter 68, commentary 398 and 401 note 4. See also S. B. Bowman, *The Jews of Byzantium, 1204–1453* (Tuscaloosa, Ala., 1985), 67–68, and Eng. trans. *ibid.*, 287, no. 93.

¹² P. Chrestos, ed., *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ Συγγράμματα* (Thessalonike, 1962–88), 2: 522.31–523.3; see also the "Calabrian" mentioned in 4: 279.9–10.

viduals and to determine whether they are or have ceased to be foreigners at any given moment, even when fairly abundant evidence about them is available. In view of the serious pitfalls arising with respect to them, it is preferable to restrict this paper to the study of well-defined foreign groups, already a weighty subject by itself. In that context it is essential to distinguish between “external” and “internal” foreigners, the latter being defined as minorities in our contemporary language. It is also mandatory to distinguish between residents and nonresidents. The former were established in Thessalonike on a permanent basis for lengthy periods, though not always indefinitely. Indeed, some of them returned to their city or land of origin, while others moved to new locations after a few years. The nonresidents comprised occasional visitors as well as individuals staying in the city to conduct their business for one or two sailing seasons at most.

A final remark is in order. The traditional litany about the paucity and the fragmented nature of evidence bearing on Byzantine topics is particularly appropriate in our case. On the whole, Byzantine sources provide general information about foreigners and attitudes toward them, yet they hardly offer any concrete indications about individuals, their presence and their activities. This is particularly obvious with respect to Thessalonike. In any event, since we deal with foreigners, the recourse to foreign sources is indispensable. Especially Western documents offer abundant and concrete evidence about foreigners in Constantinople in the Palaiologan period, yet they yield far more limited information for Thessalonike.

We may begin with “external” foreigners. The Latins were clearly the most important group among them in the three centuries or so covered by this paper, in any event with respect to their role in the city’s economy. Their activity and presence in Thessalonike were more or less sustained throughout that whole period, yet the composition and size of their group fluctuated over time. Except between 1204 and 1224, the appearance of the Latins in the city was primarily, if not exclusively, related to economic incentives. It will be necessary, therefore, to dwell upon various facets of the economic context in which the Latins operated, though without attempting to reconstruct the latter’s overall evolution in Thessalonike.

The evidence regarding the Latins in the city from ca. 1150 to 1204 is scanty. It is impossible to determine whether this is due to the nature of the extant documentation or reflects a volume of western trade less important than one would expect at first glance.¹³ By the second half of the twelfth century, Venice, Pisa, and Genoa each had its own quarter in Constantinople and had been granted commercial privileges and fiscal exemptions in the empire. Yet until 1192 Venice was the only maritime nation enjoying extensive privileges in the whole empire, which partly explains why Venetian settlers were to be found in more provincial cities than those of any other western maritime nation.¹⁴

¹³ The evidence on Latin trade in Halmyros and Corinth is far more abundant: see R.-J. Lilie, *Handel und Politik zwischen dem byzantinischen Reich und den italienischen Kommunen Venedig, Pisa und Genua in der Epoche der Komnenen und der Angeloi (1081–1204)* (Amsterdam, 1984), 188–90 and 195–97.

¹⁴ On the differing nature and geographic extent of the privileges, see D. Jacoby, “Italian Privileges and Trade in Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade: A Reconsideration,” *Anuario de estudios medievales* 24 (1994): 349–69, repr. in idem, *Trade, Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean* (Aldershot, 1997), no. II. See also Laiou, “Mechanisms,” 171–77, 179, and my reservations about some of her arguments below, p. 90 and note 23; pp. 127–28 and note 298.

Thessalonike appears in the second half of the twelfth century as destination and transit station of Venetian as well as Pisan merchants and ships, the Venetians also reaching the city by land. In addition, Thessalonike served as base of operations for some Latins established there.¹⁵ As elsewhere in the empire, their activity in Thessalonike was interrupted by political events. The Venetians either were arrested or fled in 1171, yet presumably returned a few years later. They were back at Thebes by 1175 and at Constantinople by the following year. It is likely, therefore, that such was also the case in Thessalonike long before Venice arrived at a new agreement with the empire in 1183 and concluded a new formal treaty with it in 1187.¹⁶

The expulsion of the Pisans from the empire in 1182 also interrupted the latter's trade and presence in Thessalonike for a number of years. Pisa concluded a new treaty with the empire in 1192, yet it appears that its citizens did not immediately renew their activity in the city, in any event not on the same scale as before 1182. Indeed, only five years after the conclusion of the treaty, in 1197, did Pisa request the restitution of the confiscated Pisan trading facilities in Thessalonike. Its second demand, namely the stationing of a Pisan *vicecomes*, hints for the first time at the presence of Pisan settlers in the city.¹⁷ It is likely, though, that these were also to be found earlier, since, despite the absence of privileged status in the provinces, some Pisans were established at Halmyros before 1182.¹⁸ We may thus surmise that there were both Venetian and Pisan traveling merchants as well as settlers in Thessalonike in 1185, when the city was besieged and briefly occupied by the Norman forces.¹⁹ However, since Venice enjoyed more extensive privileges than its rivals until 1192, it is likely that Venetian citizens were the dominant subgroup among the Latins operating in Thessalonike in the twelfth century. This was presumably also the case in the last decade before the Fourth Crusade, despite the extension of Pisan and Genoese privileges to the provinces in 1192.²⁰

Genoa was the third maritime power whose citizens were active in the empire in the second half of the twelfth century, yet there is no evidence of Genoese traders or settlers in Thessalonike until after the Fourth Crusade. We may nevertheless assume that Genoese ships occasionally anchored there on their way to and from Constantinople, as suggested by two of them engaging in navigation along the Greek coast in 1171. One of these vessels is attested at Halmyros and the other at Euripos, present-day Chalkis in Euboea, close to the mainland.²¹ It should be noted, though, that in that period Genoese ships also sailed between their home-city and the empire's capital via Crete and the central Aegean, a mar-

¹⁵ Survey by Lilie, *Handel und Politik*, 213–16; S. Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio nel XII secolo. I rapporti economici* (Venice, 1988), 52–53, 86–87, 93–94. Transit through Thessalonike is also implied by a land journey from Halmyros to Constantinople in 1161: R. Morozzo della Rocca and A. Lombardo, eds., *Documenti del commercio veneziano nei secoli XI–XIII* (Turin, 1940), nos. 151–52.

¹⁶ On the resumption of Venetian trade in the empire, see Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio*, 22–27; Jacoby, "Italian Privileges," 356.

¹⁷ See S. Borsari, "Pisani a Bisanzio nel XII secolo," in *Studi di storia pisana e toscana in onore del Prof. Cinzio Violante*, Biblioteca del Bollettino Storico Pisano, Collana storica 38 (Pisa, 1991), 65–66, 68; Jacoby, "Italian Privileges," 366. On trading facilities, see also below.

¹⁸ See Borsari, "Pisani a Bisanzio," 65–66.

¹⁹ On the presence of Latins at that time, see below, p. 90.

²⁰ On these privileges, see Jacoby, "Italian Privileges."

²¹ C. Imperiale di Sant'Angelo, ed., *Codice diplomatico della Repubblica di Genova* (Rome, 1936–42), 2: 213–14 note 1, 215 note 2.

itime route bypassing Thessalonike.²² It is likely, therefore, that the Genoese displayed less interest in the city than their rivals. The conjunction of the navigation pattern and the lack of extensive privileges until 1192 presumably accounts for the absence of Genoese settlers from Thessalonike.

John Kinnamos reports that sometime before 1171 Emperor Manuel I imposed a clear-cut choice upon Venetians permanently settled in the empire. He compelled them to declare whether they were his *bourgesioi* (subjects) or whether they retained their condition of visiting traders and Venetian allegiance, with all the privileges and obligations deriving from either status. In that context *bourgesioi*, a hellenized Western term, bore a dual legal meaning as in Western usage, to which Kinnamos explicitly alludes. *Burgenses* stood then for both permanent residents and a lord's subjects, in contrast to *mercatores*, visiting merchants.²³ Some fifteen years later Archbishop Eustathios of Thessalonike used *bourgesioi* in a much looser sense by applying the originally Western term to Latins in general. He reported that during the Norman siege of 1185 some individual treacherously contacted the enemy from a tower located close to the neighborhood of the *bourgesioi*.²⁴ A sitting of that neighborhood to the east of the walled city, near the ancient harbor called Kellarion,²⁵ is totally excluded, since the contact was established from within the city. Moreover, this could only be achieved if the tower faced the enemy camping in the countryside, which implies that the tower was inserted within the urban rampart. Finally, considering the Latin involvement in maritime trade, the twelfth-century Latin neighborhood must have been situated in the vicinity of the harbor. In short, we may locate it in the southwestern part of Thessalonike, close to both the wall protecting the western flank of the city and the harbor.²⁶

²² See D. Jacoby, "Byzantine Crete in the Navigation and Trade Networks of Venice and Genoa," in L. Balletto, ed., *Oriente e Occidente tra medioevo ed età moderna. Studi in onore di Geo Pistarino*, Università degli Studi di Genova, Sede di Acqui Terme, Collana di Fonti e Studi I.1 (Acqui Terme, 1997), 532–39, repr. in Jacoby, *Byzantium, Latin Romania and the Mediterranean*, no. II.

²³ John Kinnamos, *Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, ed. A. Meineke, CSHB (Bonn, 1836), 281–82 (6.10). The same meanings appear in the crusader states of the Levant: see D. Jacoby, "Les Vénitiens naturalisés dans l'Empire byzantin: Un aspect de l'expansion de Venise en Roumanie du XIII^e au milieu du XV^e siècle," *TM* 8 (1981): 219, repr. in idem, *Studies on the Crusader States and on Venetian Expansion* (Northampton, 1989), no. IX. They exclude the interpretation of Laiou, "Mechanisms," 173–74, who suggests that Manuel I granted the *bourgesioi* a special regime. There were also Pisans who became imperial subjects: see Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio*, 49–50. Not surprisingly, some Venetians and Pisans sought to take advantage of both the privileges granted to their nation and the status of Byzantine subject. It is important to note that, despite Manuel's injunction, we later find Latin permanent residents who were not imperial subjects. On the whole issue, see D. Jacoby, "The Byzantine Outsider in Trade (c. 900–c. 1350)," in Smythe, *Strangers to Themselves* (as above, note 1), 135–37.

²⁴ Eustazio di Tessalonica, *La espugnazione di Tessalonica*, ed. S. Kyriakidis, Istituto Siciliano di Studi Bizantini e Neellenici, Testi 5 (Palermo, 1961), 92.7–9, text reproduced with same pagination in Eustathios of Thessalonike, *The Capture of Thessaloniki*, with English translation by J. R. Melville-Jones, *ByzAus* 8 (Canberra, 1988). P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180* (Cambridge, 1993), 149, considers that the *bourgesioi* of Thessalonike mentioned by Eustathios were all resident Latins who had become imperial subjects. This may be excluded, considering what happened in Constantinople: see end of previous note. Moreover, if this had been the case, it would be difficult to explain why all privately held or owned Pisan premises in Thessalonike were confiscated in 1182, on which see above, p. 89.

²⁵ As suggested by Ch. Bakirtzes, "Η θαλάσσια όχύρωση της Θεσσαλονίκης (Παρατηρήσεις και προβλήματα)," *Βυζαντινά* 7 (1975): 312–13; on Kellarion, see *ibid.*, 321–22 and fig. 14.

²⁶ As suggested already by J.-M. Spieser, *Thessalonique et ses monuments du IV^e au VI^e siècle. Contribution à l'étude d'une ville paléochrétienne*, BEFAR 254 (Paris, 1984), 44. On Thessalonike's harbor, see Bakirtzes, "Η θαλάσ-

Unfortunately, a more precise siting of the twelfth-century Latin neighborhood cannot be determined. Its localization in the area covered by the Φρανγκομαχαλᾶς or Frankish quarter of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries may be safely dismissed.²⁷ Since the modern Catholic church is located some 400 m from the western city wall,²⁸ such an identification would imply that the Latin neighborhood of the twelfth century extended over a broad area covering almost the entire northern flank of the harbor. This is excluded, especially in view of the size of the Latin presence in twelfth-century Thessalonike, undoubtedly much smaller than in contemporary Constantinople.²⁹ Moreover, despite the almost continuous Western economic activity in the city, it is unclear whether a Latin neighborhood existed without interruption from the twelfth to the eighteenth century, as we shall see below, and even if it did, there is no way to ascertain whether there was continuity in its location.³⁰ Finally, since the volume of Western activity and presence in Thessalonike fluctuated over time, it is obvious that the extent of the Latin neighborhood must have similarly varied.

In all likelihood, this specific urban area served as residence for both settlers and visiting merchants, who presumably conducted much of their business in its premises. The twelfth-century imperial policy applied in provincial cities with respect to foreigners was far more flexible than in Constantinople.³¹ There is no evidence that it included the assignment of specific quarters with well-defined boundaries, space limitations with respect to residence, or impediments to the purchase of real estate, as in the capital.³² Yet the absence of imperial intervention in these matters also had its drawbacks, since the Latin neighborhood in twelfth-century Thessalonike lacked any particular privileged status. It

σα," 315–21. On the quarters of the maritime powers in Constantinople along the Golden Horn, see P. Magdalino, *Constantinople médiévale. Études sur l'évolution des structures urbaines*, Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, Collège de France, Monographies 9 (Paris, 1996), 78–90; idem, "The Maritime Neighborhoods of Constantinople: Commercial and Residential Functions, Sixth to Twelfth Centuries," *DOP* 54 (2000): 209–26. Some different topographical interpretations appear in D. Jacoby, "The Venetian Quarter of Constantinople from 1082 to 1261: Topographical Considerations," in C. Sode and S. Takács, eds., *Novum Millennium. Studies on Byzantine History and Culture Dedicated to Paul Speck* (Aldershot, 2001), 153–70. Significantly, in Halmyros one of two contiguous plots of land bought by Venetians respectively before 1150 and 1156 was located on the seashore: L. Lanfranchi, ed., *S. Giorgio Maggiore*, Fonti per la Storia di Venezia, Sez. II: Archivi ecclesiastici (Venice, 1967–74), 2: 463–70, nos. 231–33.

²⁷ This localization appears in O. Tafrali, *Topographie de Thessalonique* (Paris, 1913), 94–95, 144, followed by Kyriakidis in Eustazio di Tessalonica, *Espugnazione*, 174, and Spieser, *Thessalonique et ses monuments*, 44.

²⁸ See Bakirtzes, "Η θαλάσσια," fig. 1.

²⁹ On the size of the quarters of the major maritime powers in the capital, see the suggestions of P. Schreiner, "Untersuchungen zu den Niederlassungen westlicher Kaufleute im byzantinischen Reich des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts," *ByzF* 7 (1979): 179–81.

³⁰ It is noteworthy that there was no continuity in the location of the Jewish quarter in Thessalonike: see below.

³¹ Incidentally, this was also the case with respect to Byzantine traders and the economy in general: see N. Oikonomidès, "Le marchand byzantin des provinces (IXe–XIe s.)," in *Mercati e mercanti nell'alto medioevo: L'area euroasiatica e l'area mediterranea*. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, Spoleto, 40 (1993): 655–60; idem, "The Economic Region of Constantinople: From Directed Economy to Free Economy, and the Role of the Italians," in G. Arnaldi and G. Cavallo, eds., *Europa medievale e mondo bizantino. Contatti effettivi e possibilità di studi comparati*, Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, Nuovi studi storici 40 (Rome, 1997), 221–38.

³² See Jacoby, "Byzantine Outsider in Trade," 135–36. Note that the separate neighborhoods of the Amalfitans and the Venetians in Dyrrachion existed before 1082, when Alexios I assigned for the first time a quarter to Venice in Constantinople: A. Ducellier, *La façade maritime de l'Albanie au moyen âge. Durazzo et Valona du XIe au XVe siècle* (Thessalonike, 1981), 70–73.

may be assumed, therefore, that the Latins themselves determined the location of their residences and trading facilities in the city. The *fondaco* and houses held by the Pisans before 1182 had either been privately rented for a prolonged period or, more likely, had been privately purchased or built.³³ There is good reason to believe that the Venetians had similar premises, despite the absence of evidence in this respect. From the existence of the Pisan *fondaco* in Thessalonike we may gather that the Pisans and the Venetians resided and operated in separate, though contiguous areas within the Latin neighborhood. Such a spontaneous concentration along “national” lines is also attested for Dyrrachion and Halmyros.³⁴ Their presence, whether short-term or lengthy, implied the continuous service of a Latin clergy of low rank, as in Constantinople and in various provincial cities of the empire.³⁵ The Venetian monastery of S. Nicolò di Lido, which held property granted by Venice in various Byzantine cities, had a dependency in Thessalonike in 1165, according to an overlooked reference included in a document of 1296.³⁶ We may safely assume that this property was located within the Latin neighborhood. It is likely that the Pisans too had their own ecclesiastical institution in the same urban area, since they had two churches in Halmyros.³⁷

The occupation of Thessalonike by Boniface of Montferrat in 1204 had a threefold impact on Latin presence in the city. It introduced new social elements, resulted in an increase in the number of settlers, and reinforced Latin ecclesiastical presence. In addition to traders, there were now settlers belonging to the western nobility as well as commoners who were not necessarily engaging in commercial pursuits. Some knights serving in Boniface’s contingent of crusaders, who hailed from Lombardy, Tuscany, Provence, Burgundy, and Germany, established themselves in the city.³⁸ To those known by name we should add many others. Niketas Choniates reports that Boniface confiscated the wealthiest houses of Thessalonike and awarded them to his vassals.³⁹ Although some of these left later for their fiefs in Romania or for their homes in the West, others are attested in the city in the following years.⁴⁰ The reinforcement of the Latin clergy, headed by successive Latin archbishops, was accompanied by the seizure of Greek ecclesiastical property.⁴¹ In 1210 Pope Innocent III confirmed the grant of the monastery of Philokalos to the Order of the Tem-

³³ On the renting of such premises by foreigners in the Palaiologan period, see below, p. 96

³⁴ See respectively above, note 32, and D. Jacoby, “Migrations familiales et stratégies commerciales vénitiennes aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles,” in M. Balard et A. Ducellier, eds., *Migrations et diasporas méditerranéennes*. Byzantina Sorbonensia 19 (Paris, 2002), 360–61.

³⁵ See R.-J. Lilie, “Die lateinische Kirche in der Romania vor dem vierten Kreuzzug,” *BZ* 82 (1989): 202–11; Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio*, 36–42.

³⁶ B. Lanfranchi Strina, ed., *Codex Publicorum (Codice del Piovego)*, I (1282–1298), Fonti per la storia di Venezia, sez. I, Archivi pubblici (Venice, 1985), 207, no. 28: an old book which had been copied there was later kept in the library of the Venetian S. Nicolò di Lido. On dependencies of this monastery elsewhere in the empire, see Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio*, 36–41.

³⁷ On which see Borsari, “Pisani a Bisanzio,” 65–66.

³⁸ See J. Longnon, *Les compagnons de Villehardouin. Recherches sur les croisés de la quatrième croisade* (Genève, 1978), 227–47, and the review of that work by M.-L. Favreau, in *BZ* 72 (1979): 84–87; also J. Longnon, *L’Empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée* (Paris, 1949), 69–70, 106–9, 122–23, 162–63.

³⁹ Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. J. A. Van Dieten, CFHB II (Berlin–New York, 1975), I, 600, esp. lines 56–57.

⁴⁰ See above, note 38.

⁴¹ See R. Janin, “L’Église latine à Thessalonique de 1204 à la conquête turque,” *REB* 16 (1958): 207–14; G. Fedalto, *La chiesa latina in Oriente*, vol. 1, 2d ed. (n. pl., 1981), 290–91. Three Latin archbishops are known by name. On the first one, Warin, see Longnon, *Les compagnons de Villehardouin*, 187–88.

plars, made a few years earlier by Cardinal Benedict of Santa Susanna. The latter had been sent by the pope to conduct talks and reach an accommodation with the Greek Church and passed through Thessalonike either between June and November 1205 on his way to Constantinople, between January and the summer of 1207 on his return journey to Rome, or possibly even on both occasions. In any event, since Greek monks remained in the monastery of Philokalos, it would seem that in fact the Templars benefited only from the latter's revenue.⁴² The Cistercians received the monastery tou Chortaitou near Thessalonike, yet held no property in the city itself.⁴³ The demographic and ecclesiastical developments generated by the Latin conquest of 1204 came to an abrupt end when the ruler of Epiros, Theodore Doukas, conquered Thessalonike in 1224.

We may safely assume that Venetian trade and settlement in Thessalonike, attested before 1204, continued during the twenty years of Latin rule over the city, despite the close relations between Boniface of Montferrat and Genoa.⁴⁴ Venice's dominance in the economic life of Constantinople after the Fourth Crusade presumably exerted some impact in Thessalonike, a port of call for Venetians sailing between their own city and the Golden Horn.⁴⁵ The relations between Venice and Boniface's successor, King Demetrius, appear to have been smooth. In March 1224 the young king, gone west to obtain military assistance, testified in Venice that he had witnessed King Bela of Hungary and others seizing by force the goods of three Venetian merchants.⁴⁶ A single document illustrates Venetian trade in Thessalonike in the Latin period. It records a commercial contract concluded in the city in October 1206 between three Venetians, none of whom lived there, namely Filocalo Navigaioso, duke of Lemnos, Gilio da Foligno, a resident of Constantinople, and Foscari Raguseo of Venice.⁴⁷ It is not excluded that some Venetians exported grain produced in Thessalonike's rural hinterland, although Venetian involvement in that activity is not directly attested before 1268.⁴⁸

The treaty of 1210 between Venice and Michael I Doukas of Epiros guaranteed freedom of trade in the latter's territories, according to the terms in force in the empire dur-

⁴² PL 216: 328, doc. CXLV; see also Janin, "L'Église latine à Thessalonique," 214. For the dating of Benedict's passage through Thessalonike, see D. Jacoby, "The Jewish Community of Constantinople from the Komnenan to the Palaiologan Period," *VizVrem* 55.2 (80) (1998): 37, repr. in idem, *Byzantium, Latin Romania and the Mediterranean*, no. V.

⁴³ See W. Haberstumpf, *Dinastie nel Mediterraneo orientale. I Monferrato e i Savoia nei secoli XII–XV* (Turin, 1995), 177–88.

⁴⁴ On which see below, p. 95.

⁴⁵ See D. Jacoby, "Venetian Settlers in Latin Constantinople (1204–1261): Rich or Poor?" in Ch. A. Maltzou, ed., *Πλούσιοι και πτωχοί στην κοινωνία της έλληνολατινικής Ανατολής* (= *Ricchi e poveri nella società dell'Oriente grecolatino*), Biblioteca dell'Istituto ellenico di Studi bizantini e postbizantini di Venezia 19 (Venice, 1998), 181–204, repr. in Jacoby, *Byzantium, Latin Romania and the Mediterranean*, no. VII.

⁴⁶ The testimony is recorded in a dated notarial charter: R. Cessi, ed., *Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio di Venezia* (Bologna, 1931–50), 1: 56–57, §51 (hereafter Cessi, *DMC*).

⁴⁷ Reference in a document of 1210: Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti del commercio veneziano*, no. 519. On Filocalo Navigaioso, see G. Saint-Guillain, "Deux îles grecques au temps de l'Empire latin. Andros et Lemnos au XIII^e siècle," *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen Âge* 113 (2001): 603–9.

⁴⁸ See below, note 77. The grain on board a Genoese ship anchoring at Negroponte in 1251 may well have originated in Thessalonike. On this cargo, see M. Balard, "Les Génois en Romanie entre 1204 et 1261. Recherches sur les minutiers notariaux génois," *MélRome* 78 (1966): 484, repr. in idem, *La mer Noire et la Romanie génoise (XIII^e–XV^e siècles)* (London, 1989), no. I. It would seem that the Genoese were already exporting grain from the empire by the 1140s: Jacoby, "Byzantine Crete," 532, 535.

ing the reign of Manuel I Komnenos.⁴⁹ The treaty must have been extended to Thessalonike after the city's conquest by Theodore Doukas in 1224.⁵⁰ As reported in June 1228, the ship of the Venetian Marco Minotto ran aground on the island of Corfu, ruled by Theodore. The island's governor confiscated the salvaged goods and money belonging to the merchants, contrary to a specific clause included in the agreement of 1210. The incident soured relations between Venice and Theodore. In reprisal Venice decreed on 13 August of the same year an embargo on trade with Theodore's territories.⁵¹ We do not know how long it remained in force, nor whether it affected Venetian trade in Thessalonike.⁵²

There was no reason for Venetian settlers to abandon the city, nor for traveling Venetian merchants to bypass it after its capture by John III Vatatzes in 1246. Venice's treaty of 1219 with Theodore I Laskaris of Nicaea, which points to Venetian trade between Constantinople and the Greek state in Asia Minor,⁵³ appears to have been followed before 1261 by at least two further agreements, as implied by a letter of Emperor Andronikos II sent to Venice in 1319. One of these treaties, which have not been preserved, was concluded with John III Vatatzes between 1221 and 1254, the other with Theodore II Laskaris between 1254 and 1258.⁵⁴ They must have been beneficial to Venetian interests in Thessalonike, yet there are no notarial documents illustrating Venetian trade or presence in the city under these two rulers.⁵⁵

We have noted that the Pisans had property in the Latin neighborhood of Thessalonike and that they resided and traded there alongside the Venetians before the Latin conquest of 1204. They are not attested in the city during the Latin period, nor after the renewal of Byzantine rule in 1224. It is nevertheless likely that they continued to visit the city on their way to and from Constantinople, where they pursued their trade, though on a reduced scale compared with the late twelfth century.⁵⁶ Pisans also appear in the Empire

⁴⁹ G. L. Fr. Tafel and G. M. Thomas, eds., *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig* (Vienna, 1856–57) (hereafter TTh), 2: 120–23. On this treaty and its economic context, see Ducellier, *La façade maritime*, 132–36. On Venetian trade with Epiros, see also A. Schaubé, *Handelsgeschichte der romanischen Völker des Mittelmeergebiets bis zum Ende der Kreuzzüge* (Munich, 1906), 266–67.

⁵⁰ On Venetian trade from 1223 to 1227 with Albania, then under the rule of Epiros, see Ducellier, *La façade maritime*, 182–85.

⁵¹ Cessi, *DMC* 1: 196–97, §94 (10 June 1228); 202, §113 (13 August 1228). F. Bredenkamp, *The Byzantine Empire of Thessaloniki (1224–1242)* (Thessalonike, 1996), 143–47, contends that the embargo induced Theodore I to conclude a truce of one year with Narzot of Toucy, governor of the Latin Empire. This may be ruled out, since the agreement was reached by 14 September 1228: text in Cessi, *DMC* 1: 209–10, §140. It is hardly plausible that the news of the embargo decreed one month earlier reached either Theodore or Constantinople before that date. Moreover, Venice did not underwrite the agreement, as claimed by Bredenkamp.

⁵² D. M. Nicol, *The Despotate of Epiros* (Oxford, 1957), 106, asserts that trade relations were reestablished only under Theodore's brother Manuel Doukas, who ruled over Thessalonike from 1230 until ca. 1237, yet fails to provide evidence supporting his view.

⁵³ TTh 2: 205–7.

⁵⁴ G. M. Thomas and R. Predelli, eds., *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum* (Venice, 1880–99) (hereafter DVL), 2: 141. S. Brezeanu, “La politique économique des Lascarides à la lumière des relations vénéto-nicéennes,” in E. Stănescu et N.-Ș. Tanoșoca, eds., *Études byzantines et post-byzantines*, vol. 1 (Bucharest, 1979), 39–54, offers an unwarranted negative view of Venetian-Nicaean trade relations, which incidentally does not take into account the evidence mentioned here.

⁵⁵ Despite an intensive search in Venice, I have been unable to discover any such document drafted between 1206 and 1274. Those issued in these specific years are mentioned here.

⁵⁶ See S. Borsari, “I rapporti tra Pisa e gli stati di Romania nel Duecento,” *RSI* 67 (1955): 477–86; D. Jacoby, “The Urban Evolution of Latin Constantinople (1204–1261),” in N. Necipoğlu, ed., *Byzantine Constantinople: Monuments, Topography and Everyday Life* (Leiden, 2001), 283.

of Nicaea around 1240.⁵⁷ The absence of information regarding their activity in Thessalonike requires an explanation, which will be offered below.

The rule of Boniface of Montferrat, which began in 1204, appears to have favored Genoese trade in Thessalonike, in any event in the short term. Genoese ships are attested there in 1205 and 1206. In the spring of 1205 Boniface captured the former emperor Alexios III Angelos in Thessaly. He first left him at Halmyros, yet later took him along when he returned to Thessalonike. Still in the same year he sent Alexios to his own estate of Montferrat in Italy on board a ship from Portovenere leaving Thessalonike for Genoa.⁵⁸ The following year two merchants sailed from Genoa to Thessalonike, where they were expected to repay the maritime loans they had obtained, and Boniface's daughter was brought to the city with an escort of four ships undoubtedly carrying merchants and goods.⁵⁹ We have noted that Genoese ships occasionally used Crete as a transit station before the Fourth Crusade.⁶⁰ The Genoese Enrico Pescatore invaded Crete in 1206, yet failed to capture it. His defeat by Venice in 1211 opened the way to the latter's occupation of the island.⁶¹ The Genoese must have largely, if not entirely, avoided Crete after these developments, which were followed by periods of intermittent warfare between their city and Venice. As a result the importance of Thessalonike as a Genoese stopover in Romania must have increased. Genoese activity in Constantinople was resumed by 1232 and appears to have become more intensive than commonly assumed in the following years.⁶² Significantly, a Genoese shipping contract of 1254 envisaged the unloading of goods in either Negroponte, Thessalonike, or Constantinople.⁶³ The Genoese presence in this city did not cease even after the outbreak of a new war between Venice and Genoa in 1256. Indeed, there were some Genoese settlers dispersed among the Latins remaining in Constantinople soon after the city reverted to Byzantine rule in 1261.⁶⁴ We may assume that, similarly, Genoese merchants pursued their activity in Thessalonike in these years.

The Byzantine recovery of Constantinople in 1261 robbed Venice of its dominant and privileged position in the city and generated a massive exodus of Venetians, though it would seem that not all of them left.⁶⁵ Venice's relations with the empire in the period extending to 1302 were characterized by a climate of tension, mutual suspicion, and intermittent conflict, partly interrupted by temporary truces in 1268, 1277, 1285, and 1302.⁶⁶

⁵⁷ See Borsari, "Rapporti," 487–88.

⁵⁸ L. T. Belgrano and C. Imperiale di Sant'Angelo, eds., *Annali Genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi continuatori* (Rome, 1890–1929), 2: 95. This chronicle records the presence of the ship in Thessalonike. On the capture of Alexios III, see R.-J. Loenertz, "Aux origines du Despotat d'Épire et de la Principauté d'Achaïe," *Byzantion* 43 (1973): 370–73.

⁵⁹ Balard, "Génois en Roumanie," 472–73.

⁶⁰ See above, pp. 89–90.

⁶¹ On these events, see D. Jacoby, "Changing Economic Patterns in Latin Romania: The Impact of the West," in A. E. Laiou and R. P. Mottahedeh, eds., *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World* (Washington, D.C., 2001), 207–8.

⁶² See Jacoby, "Venetian Settlers," 198–99; idem, "Urban Evolution," 283.

⁶³ Ed. E. H. Byrne, *Genoese Shipping in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1930), 125–28, no. XXXVII.

⁶⁴ Georges Pachymérès, *Relations historiques*, ed. A. Failler, vol. 1, CFHB 24 (Paris, 1984), 221.4–10.

⁶⁵ See D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258–1282: A Study in Byzantine-Latin Relations* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), 113–14; Jacoby, "Urban Evolution," 294–95; idem, "Venetian Settlers," 188–89.

⁶⁶ For an overview of these relations, see D. Jacoby, "La Venezia d'oltremare nel secondo Duecento," in G. Cracco and G. Ortalli, eds., *Storia di Venezia dalle origini alla caduta della Serenissima*, II. *L'età del Comune* (Rome, 1995), 266–73. The agreement of 1265 was not ratified by Venice: see below.

Not surprisingly, these treaties devote much attention to Constantinople, yet none at all or little to Thessalonike. In 1265 Emperor Michael VIII was clearly suspicious of Venetian intentions and therefore offered Venice a place for the lodging of its citizens outside the *kastron* or walled city of Thessalonike.⁶⁷ He promised that Venice would have precedence over any other western maritime nation, should he grant them property in Thessalonike proper.⁶⁸ It is unclear whether these facilities were intended for visiting merchants only or for all Venetians, in which case the emperor's undertaking would imply that Venetian settlers had left or had been compelled to leave the city in 1261. The draft of the treaty also provided that the Venetians would be free to conduct religious services according to the Latin rite in the churches they would hold in their places of residence, and that these churches would not be subject to the authority of the imperial Church.⁶⁹ The proposed treaty illustrates Venetian interest in the full resumption of trade in Thessalonike, yet Venice did not consider it satisfactory and therefore refused to ratify it.⁷⁰

Surprisingly, neither Thessalonike nor any other city except Constantinople is mentioned in the Venetian-Byzantine treaty of 1268, which on the whole offered the Venetians better conditions than those of 1265. They were allowed to rent houses, ovens, and bath-houses wherever they would reside, *ubi fuerint dicti Veneti et habitabunt*. It is unclear whether the Latin version of the treaty, the only one to survive, implies the renewed presence of settlers in Thessalonike and elsewhere, or refers in more general terms to all Venetians. In any event, these were allowed to use their own weights and measures in transactions among themselves. Churches would be put at their disposal, as illustrated for instance in Constantinople, which implies that the Venetian ecclesiastical institutions existing in Thessalonike, presumably until 1261, had been confiscated. The clause concerning religious services and the relations with the Greek Church was similar to the one included in the projected treaty of 1265, yet was limited to the period covered by the truce.⁷¹ This important restriction, which has been overlooked until now, implies that the envisaged dispositions regarding the churches were temporary.

The list of Venetian claims for compensation compiled in March 1278 offers precious information about Venetian traders and their operations in Thessalonike in the previous decade and illustrates the serious difficulties they sometimes encountered. The widespread activity of pirates and corsairs, among them Latins, clearly hampered trade. Some

⁶⁷ This proposal was similar to the one he had made to the Genoese in 1261, see below, p. 114. Draft of the treaty with Venice in TTh 2: 62–89, Greek and Latin versions, and see esp. 70 and 81; new ed. of both versions by M. Pozza and G. Ravegnani, *I trattati con Bisanzio, 1265–1285*, *Pacta veneta* 6 (Venice, 1995), 26–47, no. 2, and see esp. 33–36, §§5–6. While the Greek version mentions τόπον εἰς κάθισμα, the Latin one, which is more explicit, refers to the construction of dwellings: *terram et locum pro faciundo . . . seçium [= sedium] et mansionem*. In Constantinople too Michael VIII offered Venice land outside the walled city, on the opposite side of the Golden Horn: TTh 3: 70 and 81–82; new ed. Pozza and Ravegnani, *Trattati*, 34–35, §5. See also R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, 2d ed. (Paris, 1964), 248.

⁶⁸ TTh 3: 70 and 82; new ed. Pozza and Ravegnani, *Trattati*, 34–35, §5. Here again there is a discrepancy with respect to the city between the Greek version, which uses ἐντός, and the Latin one, which reads *prope*, i.e., near and not within. The Greek version is clearly the more reliable.

⁶⁹ TTh 3: 73 and 84; new ed. Pozza and Ravegnani, *Trattati*, 38–40, §9. The churches would be put at their disposal, as illustrated for instance in Constantinople and implied by the treaty of 1268: see below.

⁷⁰ The treaty was less favorable to Venice than assumed by Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, 182–83, who suggests other factors that may have motivated Venice's refusal to ratify it: *ibid.*, 183–85.

⁷¹ TTh 3: 96; new ed. Pozza and Ravegnani, *Trattati*, 60, no. 4, §§5–6.

of these Latins resided in Thessalonike and used the city as their base for attacks in the Aegean.⁷² Two of them were called “knights”: Rolandus *cavalerius*, also mentioned as *miles* of Thessalonike, who operated with a Greek crew, presumably in cooperation with his nephew Pardo, and one Lanfrancus *chavallari*.⁷³ Johannes Senzaraxon, or “madman,” also appears to have been a Latin, despite his Greek surname, or rather nickname, and the fact that he is mentioned as a Byzantine subject, since one of his three nephews was called Raymondinus. He too operated with a Greek crew.⁷⁴ Another pirate by the name of Prando is identified as Pisan.⁷⁵ Several Venetian residents of Negroponte on their way from that city to Thessalonike were robbed of their goods, which included oil, honey, pitch, and western woollens.⁷⁶

According to the list of claims, the Venetians suffered in Thessalonike proper from the hostility of imperial officials and other individuals. There were cases of illegal taxation and other exactions, among them on grain for export to Venice, illegal seizures of merchandise, and administrative impediments delaying, hindering, or preventing the unloading or sale of goods, some of which were thrown into the sea. Pietro Venier was robbed of his unloaded ship anchoring in the harbor and imprisoned for six months. There was also looting after shipwreck.⁷⁷ We should beware of considering these incidents as the rule. Venetian traders would have stopped visiting Thessalonike had this been the case. Indirectly and paradoxically, then, the Venetian complaints seem to reflect an expanding traffic, an assumption enhanced by the appearance of Venetian residents and consuls in the city in the same period.

Indeed, in the 1270s we find some Venetians who resided in Thessalonike for lengthy periods or had settled there. According to an unpublished document, a Venetian ship from Negroponte was immobilized in Thessalonike from 1271 to the spring of 1274. It is unclear why it remained there. Three Venetians, one Genoese, and two other Latins from Negroponte who had served as sailors on board ran off with the advance payment they had

⁷² See P. Charanis, “Piracy in the Aegean during the Reign of Michael VIII Palaeologus,” *AIPHOS* 10 (1950): 127–36, repr. in idem, *Social, Economic and Political Life in the Byzantine Empire* (London, 1973), no. XII; H. Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer. La marine de guerre, la politique et les institutions maritimes de Byzance aux VIIe–XVe siècles* (Paris, 1966), 369–70; G. Morgan, “The Venetian Claims Commission of 1278,” *BZ* 69 (1976): 412–38; Ch. A. Maltezos, “Θεσσαλονίκη: Ὁμητήριο κουρσάρων στὰ τέλη τοῦ 13ου αἰώνα,” in *Βυζαντινὴ Μακεδονία, 324–1430 μ.Χ. Διεθνὲς Συμπόσιο, Ἑταιρεία Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν* (Thessalonike, 1995), 209–16, on the organization and operations of the corsairs and their cooperation with the authorities in Thessalonike.

⁷³ TTh 3: 181, 188, 216, 217, 223–24, 251, 261, and for the last one, 236; see Morgan, “Venetian Claims,” 422. The two individuals were clearly Latins. On their surname, see Maltezos, “Θεσσαλονίκη,” 211. Some Byzantine Greeks also bore the patronymic surnames Καβαλλάριος or Καβαλλάρης: *PLP* 10024–44. Alexios Chavalari, possibly an imperial official, is mentioned in a Venetian document of 1389: ed. J. Chrysostomides, “Venetian Commercial Privileges under the Palaeologi,” *SiVen* 12 (1970): 351.

⁷⁴ On his operations, see Morgan, “Venetian Claims,” 421. The other nephews were called Nicolas and Bartolomeus, names that could be either Greek or Latin. On family connections between them, see TTh 3: 178, 191, 204, 218. G. Makris, *Studien zur byzantinischen Schifffahrt*, Collana storica di fonti e studi, diretta da G. Pistarino, 52 (Genoa, 1988), 199–200, postulates that the names of the nephews indicate that Johannes Senzaraxon was a *gasmoulos*, an unwarranted deduction.

⁷⁵ TTh 3: 262–63; he is possibly identical with Pari Pisanus, mentioned *ibid.*, 264.

⁷⁶ TTh 3: 199, no. II, and 241, no. XVI; Morgan, “Venetian Claims,” 428–29, nos. 18, 62. The merchant involved in the second case was Rinaldo de Niola, *burgensis* of Negroponte, whose career can be partly reconstructed: see Jacoby, “Migrations familiales,” 370.

⁷⁷ TTh 3: 168–69, 177–78, 260, 278–80 (grain exports); Morgan, “Venetian Claims,” 432, 434, 435, respectively nos. 176, 182, 233, 248–52.

received on account of their wages, as well as with various goods.⁷⁸ It is likely that they stayed in Thessalonike for some time in order to remain beyond the reach of Venetian justice. One of the Venetian owners of the vessel, Jacopo Ansaldo, also remained in the city to pursue his trading. In 1276, thus around five years after his arrival, he owned or had rented a house and a warehouse in which he kept grain and had some horses used for transportation. In February 1277 he complained to the city's governor that he had not been fully paid for woollens sold to a Greek. After being rebutted by the governor, who was a business partner of that Greek, he threatened to turn to the Venetian consul in the city and request that the latter order reprisals against the merchant. The governor displayed utter contempt toward the consul and Jacopo Ansaldo and, moreover, sent people to the latter's home to seize some of his goods.⁷⁹ The information regarding this merchant reveals that he imported woollens in order to buy grain from producers, store it in Thessalonike, and either ship it himself from there or else serve as commercial agent or middleman in transactions involving other Venetians. He was clearly not the only one acting in that way. The Venetian export of grain from Thessalonike appears to have been conducted by traders based either in Venice or in Negroponte.⁸⁰

Growing Venetian trade and the presence of settlers in Thessalonike account for the appearance of a Venetian consul in the city, attested in 1273 or early 1274, several decades earlier than commonly assumed.⁸¹ It is not excluded that at first he was chosen from among the merchants visiting the city or the few individuals established there in order to deal with internal litigation. Carentano Zane, the first consul known by name, may have already been elected by the authorities in Venice.⁸² This was certainly the case with Pietro Michiel, who in 1276 was serving as consul.⁸³ It should be stressed, however, that the consul's authority was not recognized by the empire until 1277.⁸⁴ In August 1287 the Maggior Consiglio of Venice allocated the sum of 20 solidi grossi to cover the impending journey of the newly elected consul to Thessalonike.⁸⁵ Two years later the holder of the office had returned ill to Venice and was remaining there. As an emergency measure the merchants

⁷⁸ Archivio di Stato di Padova, Archivio Diplomatico, b.18, no. 2630, 5 August 1274.

⁷⁹ TTh 3: 271–72. Incorrect dating by Morgan, “Venetian Claims,” 433, no. 193. Since the Venetian year began in March, the reference is to 1277. The incident took place one year before the last February preceding the compilation of the report in March 1278.

⁸⁰ Respectively TTh 3: 278–80, nos. VI–XI, of 1277, and no. XII, of 1272. See Jacoby, “La Venezia d’oltremare,” 270, where I deal with the export of grain from Thessalonike and Herakleia in Thrace, and not import to, as mistakenly printed.

⁸¹ Thiriet, “Vénitiens à Thessalonique,” 323–25, is clearly wrong in postponing the organization and development of Venetian presence in Thessalonike to the period following 1303, an interpretation reproduced in F. Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au Moyen Âge. Le développement et l’exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XIIe–XVe siècles)*, BEFAR 193 (Paris, 1959), 339–40 [reprinted in 1975, with additional bibliography].

⁸² TTh 3: 279–80: more than four years before the report of March 1278.

⁸³ TTh 3: 270: *annum suum consulatui* (sic!) *in principio*, a rather clumsy formulation. The reference is to the beginning of his term of office one and a half years or so before the claims list was completed, i.e., in September 1276 at the latest. The full name of the consul is mentioned elsewhere, in connection with a letter he sent to Piero Badoer, Venetian *bailo* in Constantinople from 1276 onward: *ibid.*, 188; on Badoer, see Ch. A. Maltezou, *Ὁ θεσμός τοῦ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει βενετοῦ βαΐλου (1268–1453)* [= *The Institution of the Venetian Bailo in Constantinople (1268–1453)*] (Athens, 1970), 102. The dating by Morgan, “Venetian Claims,” 431, no. 122, is incorrect.

⁸⁴ See below, pp. 99–100.

⁸⁵ Cessi, *DMC*, 3: 179, §88.

leaving for Thessalonike were empowered to elect a consul from among themselves. It was understood that the latter would serve until being replaced by a new consul chosen in Venice according to the common procedure.⁸⁶ The whole arrangement implies that the Venetians residing in Thessalonike at that time were few in number or that they lacked the social standing required for the office of consul. In any event, the continuity of the latter supposes a certain volume of regular Venetian traffic and continuous presence in Thessalonike.

This is also conveyed by the Venetian-Byzantine treaty of 1277, which reflects Venice's growing interest in the city. Venice was granted the church of the Armenians and three houses close to it, one for the lodging of the consul, one for his two councillors, and another to serve as warehouse for the Commune's goods. In addition, Emperor Michael VIII promised the use of twenty-five rent-free houses, the number being increased or restricted according to the number of merchants arriving in the city. The arrangement with respect to these houses was thus flexible, renewable at each seasonal arrival, and limited to the duration of the merchants' stay. As explicitly stated, unused houses would be returned in the meantime to their owners.⁸⁷ It is unclear whether the imperial treasury paid the rent for these houses or whether the latter were requisitioned by imperial order for a specific period. In any event, contrary to the common view, the emperor did not transfer these houses to Venetian ownership, nor did he grant Venice any quarter in Thessalonike.⁸⁸ It is highly significant in our context that the disposition regarding the houses was similar to the one envisaged for Constantinople, whereas in other Byzantine cities the Venetians would have to pay for rented facilities.⁸⁹ With respect to Constantinople, though, the treaty of 1277 mentions a well-defined urban area corresponding to the pre-1204 Venetian quarter, in which the allotted houses would be located.⁹⁰ No such topographical definition was provided for Thessalonike, which emphasizes the difference between the two cities with respect to Venetian residence. Incidentally, the treaty of 1277 renewed the clauses dealing with the Venetians' use of their own weights and measures and the use of churches.⁹¹ The subsequent treaties of 1285, 1302, and 1310 merely confirmed the terms of 1277 regarding Thessalonike, the latter clauses implicitly.⁹²

Significantly, the treaty of 1277 did not include any provisions regarding Venetians already established or those wishing to establish themselves in Thessalonike and therefore does not provide any indication about settlers. It is clear, though, that the latter's presence was one of the factors that induced Venice to obtain various important concessions from Michael VIII. The emperor recognized anew the status of the Venetian *bailo* in Constantinople and, for the first time, also that of Venice's official representatives elsewhere in the

⁸⁶ Ibid., 243, §86.

⁸⁷ MM 3: 88–89 (Greek); TTh, 3: 140 (Latin); new ed. Pozza and Ravegnani, *Trattati*, 88–90, no. 7, §4.

⁸⁸ As argued by Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, 301; A. E. Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins. The Foreign Policy of Andronicus II, 1282–1328* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), 63, and D. M. Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice: A Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations* (Cambridge, 1988), 199–200.

⁸⁹ See above, note p. 96.

⁹⁰ MM 3: 88; TTh 3: 139; new ed. Pozza and Ravegnani, *Trattati*, 87–89, no. 7, §3. On the area, see Jacoby, "Venetian Quarter," 154–59.

⁹¹ MM, 3: 88–89; TTh, 3: 141; new ed. Pozza and Ravegnani, *Trattati*, 88–90, no. 7, §§4, 6–7; 115–16, no. 8, §§4, 6–7.

⁹² TTh 3: 327–28, 345–46; new ed. Pozza and Ravegnani, *Trattati*, 139–40, no. 10, §§4, 6–7, and *ibid.*, 157–58, no. 11, §4, 6–7; *DVL* 1: 82–85.

empire. As mentioned earlier, in Thessalonike it was a consul. Moreover, like the Venetian *bailo* in Constantinople, the other officials would determine who enjoyed Venetian status and would exercise authority over all Venetians.⁹³ It was understood that these included both settlers and visiting merchants, regardless of whether they were citizens, subjects, or foreigners who had acquired Venetian nationality. The granting of Venetian status to foreigners was a device widely used by Venice in the eastern Mediterranean at that time. It is likely, therefore, that some naturalized Greeks were to be found among the Venetians residing in Thessalonike.⁹⁴ On the other hand, the problem of the Venetian *gasmouloi*, individuals of mixed Venetian-Greek parentage, was raised only with respect to Constantinople, which suggests that there were few of them, if any, in Thessalonike.⁹⁵ Three factors may account for the difference between the two cities in this respect, namely the small number of Venetians residing in Thessalonike in the previous period, the early Byzantine recovery of the city in 1224, and the absence in the latter of Venetian political authority, contrary to that enjoyed by the Commune in Constantinople from 1204 to 1261.

The Byzantine recognition of the consul's authority in Thessalonike, stated in 1277 though without mentioning his office by name, was an important political achievement for Venice and surely reflects increased Venetian interest in the city. However, it should not mislead us with respect to the volume of Venetian presence and trading. The office of consul in Thessalonike, granted for two years, remained of low rank compared with other similar Venetian offices overseas.⁹⁶ It was subordinate to the authority of the Venetian *bailo* in Constantinople and carried no salary, except in special circumstances mentioned below, though its holder enjoyed some revenue accruing from certain payments or taxes. The consul in Thessalonike was allowed to conduct trade, an activity prohibited to Venetian state officials in higher positions.⁹⁷ The fairly low level of official Venetian representation

⁹³ MM 3: 90–91; TTh 3: 142; new ed. Pozza and Ravegnani, *Trattati*, 93–95, no. 7, §9. The first *bailo* in Constantinople was appointed in 1268: see Maltezos, *Ὁ θεσμός*, 100–101.

⁹⁴ On Venetian status and naturalization, see Jacoby, "Vénitiens naturalisés," 217–35. For a specific case of naturalization in Thessalonike, see below, p. 108.

⁹⁵ MM 3: 89; TTh 3: 140, 328, 346; new ed. Pozza and Ravegnani, *Trattati*, 90–91, no. 7, §5, 115, no. 8, §5, 140, no. 10, §5, 158, no. 11, §5. The reference is to *gasmouloi* under the authority of the Venetian *bailo*. On the issue of these *gasmouloi*, see Jacoby, "Vénitiens naturalisés," 221–22.

⁹⁶ A two-year service for officials posted overseas appears to have been the rule since the first half of the 13th century: see D. Jacoby, "L'expansion occidentale dans le Levant: Les Vénitiens à Acre dans la seconde moitié du treizième siècle," *JMedHist* 3 (1977): 231, repr. in idem, *Recherches sur la Méditerranée orientale du XIIe au XVe siècle. Peuples, sociétés, économies* (London, 1979), no. VII. Morgan, "Venetian Claims," 420, asserts that three consuls served in Thessalonike in 1275–76, which is excluded. Two of them, Mainardi Benincasa (and not Benenca, as in TTh) and Tommaso Contarini, are mentioned together as issuing letters of confirmation, which does not imply that they had served at the same time: TTh 3: 191. For a similar case involving three former *baili* of Negroponte, see *ibid.*, 162.

⁹⁷ The prohibition against conducting trade while serving in certain offices was already enforced by 1272: Cessi, *DMC*, 2: 359–60, VIII, §III. The description of the consul's office by Thiriet, "Vénitiens à Thessalonique," 325, partly repeated with some variations in idem, *Romanie vénitienne*, 340, is mistaken on several counts. As a rule the consulship was not granted *per gratiam* to those who offered themselves to serve, as clearly stated in the case of Giuliano Zancaruol, for whom an exception was made: see below, p. 102. The consuls were duly elected in Venice, and not appointed, except in special circumstances as in 1289: see above, pp. 98–99. There is not a single piece of evidence pointing to Venetian settlers in Thessalonike obtaining the office. Finally, the consul did not receive any salary, again except in special circumstances: see below, p. 102. It follows that a resolution of 1278 stating that a consul elected by merchants receives no salary was anyhow not relevant for Thessalonike. For its text: Cessi, *DMC* 3: 68, §LXXXVIII.

in the city clearly points to the relatively minor function of the latter in Venice's long-distance maritime commerce, the reasons for which will soon be examined.

Considering the nature of the consulship in Thessalonike, it may be assumed that those interested in it either had already conducted trade in the past with the city or else intended to expand their activity there by taking advantage of their function. Moreover, once they left the office they could easily exploit the trading connections they had established. While serving as consul in 1273 or 1274 Carentano Zane sold both in Thessalonike proper and in its hinterland the western woolens he imported. Interestingly, he sent his servant to the Macedonian city of Melnik with some pieces of textile, for which the *kommerkion* was extracted at an unspecified place, although the Venetians were exempt from that tax. In September 1277, some three years after leaving office, Zane exported grain from Thessalonike.⁹⁸ His activity points once more to the connection between Venetian imports of woolens and purchases of grain for export.⁹⁹ The Venetians acted exclusively as wholesalers of woolens, and this appears also to have been the case with the servant sent inland by Carentano Zane, mentioned earlier. On the other hand, the retail trade in woolens was in Greek hands.¹⁰⁰ With respect to this commodity, the division of market activity between Venetians and local Greeks was maintained throughout the entire Byzantine period. It is clearly stated in 1425, when the Thessalonians demanded from Venice a return to past practices.¹⁰¹

It may be taken for granted that there were no Venetian settlers, visiting merchants, or consuls in Thessalonike in the period extending from the summer of 1296 to late 1302, during which Venice and the empire were at war.¹⁰² The renewal of Venetian trade in the city must have come soon afterwards. Venetian ships were operating along the Macedonian coast in 1307 and reaching Thessalonike as a matter of routine.¹⁰³ There was a temporary halt in 1310, when Venice put pressure on Emperor Andronikos II. In May of that year it prohibited the sailing of Venetians on board armed vessels to Thessalonike, the Dardanelles, and the Black Sea until the conclusion of a new treaty with the empire, which took place in November.¹⁰⁴ The export of grain from Thessalonike is regularly mentioned in the following years.¹⁰⁵

Contemporary sources offer some evidence regarding Venetian consuls in Thessalonike, some of whom were residents of Romania, and the problems they and other Venetians encountered. Emanuele Mazamano of Negroponte, who served as consul in 1313 or 1314, was robbed by Thessalonians of goods evaluated at more than 700 hyperpera.¹⁰⁶ He

⁹⁸ TTh 3: 279–80. The first of these activities took place more than four years before the report of March 1278.

⁹⁹ A similar pattern appears at Chiarenza, the main port of the Frankish Peloponnese, where woolens were imported to finance the purchase of silk: see Jacoby, "Changing Economic Patterns," 228.

¹⁰⁰ See examples above, p. 98, and below, p. 111.

¹⁰¹ See below, p. 111.

¹⁰² On which see Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*, 104–12.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 208–9.

¹⁰⁴ F. Thiriet, *Délibérations des assemblées vénitiennes concernant la Romanie* (Paris–The Hague, 1966–71), 1: no. 214; Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*, 236.

¹⁰⁵ A. E. Laiou-Thomadakis, "The Byzantine Economy in the Mediterranean Trade System: Thirteenth–Fifteenth Centuries," *DOP* 34–35 (1980–81): 183, repr. in eadem, *Gender, Society and Economic Life in Byzantium* (Aldershot, 1992), no. VII. On the export of other commodities in that period, see below, p. 105.

¹⁰⁶ Ed. Thiriet, *Délibérations*, 1: 300, no. 326, whose reading "Mazamara" is erroneous.

was succeeded in 1316 by Marco Celsi of Venice, to whom the government denied the revenue deriving from the measuring of oil, allotted to previous consuls, because he had mismanaged some business deals in the past.¹⁰⁷ While in office Celsi traded in valonia, the acorn cups of the oak used in tanning and dyeing.¹⁰⁸ He was followed in 1318 by Giuliano Zancaruol, a Venetian settled in Crete, whose stationing in Thessalonike was considered very useful since he spoke Greek. For that reason he was awarded the income deriving from the renting out of the houses granted by the empire for the accommodation of visiting merchants, in addition to an annual salary of 50 Venetian pounds. The resolution adopted by the Maggior Consiglio regarding his election clearly stresses the exceptional nature of the conditions from which he benefited.¹⁰⁹ Despite this specification, the latter also appear to have been granted to the following consuls. In 1328 the Venetian *bailo* in Constantinople, Marco Corner, was ordered to compensate the consul in Thessalonike, Nicolà Celsi, for the loss of revenue accruing from the renting out of the houses and to transfer the latter to the consul's authority.¹¹⁰ A proposal submitted to the Senate to grant a salary to the consul posted in Thessalonike, coupled with a prohibition against trading while in office, was defeated in 1324.¹¹¹ Nevertheless, this instance, as well as some of the previous ones, point to a slight upgrading of the consul's office, undoubtedly related to an increase in Venetian presence and trading in the city in these years.

A list of Venetian complaints based on various reports, some supplied by former Venetian consuls in Thessalonike, was compiled before March 1320. Individual Greeks and especially imperial officials involved in trade and intent on furthering their personal interests mistreated Venetian merchants and inflicted heavy damage upon them, similar to that reported in the Venetian claims list of 1278. The officials compelled the merchants to pay taxes from which they were exempt and prevented, hindered, or delayed the purchase or unloading of goods. One of the officials, mentioned as "capitaneus" of the city, acted that way in order to ensure the sale of grain he himself had imported to Thessalonike. Some Greeks refused to pay fully for the goods they had received, did not submit to the jurisdiction of the Venetian consul when the plaintiff was Venetian, as prescribed by the Venetian-Byzantine treaties, and assaulted the Venetians if they protested.

Although the Venetians had the right to dwell freely in the empire wherever they wished, they were denied this right by force in Thessalonike, as in Constantinople, Ainos, and unspecified Byzantine islands. In addition, as stated in 1320 and 1322, the Byzantine authorities in Thessalonike did not always implement the clauses of the treaties regarding the accommodation and the church to which visiting Venetian merchants were entitled. Occasionally they denied them reasonable quarters and provided only small buildings

¹⁰⁷ Ed. *ibid.*, 302, no. 354. The correct reading is presumably *utilitatem metri* (and not *meri*) *olei*. On the use of *metrum* as a measure for oil in Thessalonike, see the trade manual of Francesco Balducci Pegolotti, *La pratica della mercatura*, ed. A. Evans (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), 161. One should remember that the Venetians had been granted the use of their own weights and measures among themselves: see above, p. 96. On *metrum* for oil and wine in the empire, see M. F. Hendy, *Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy, c. 300–1450* (Cambridge, 1985), 334–37. It would seem that Celsi had invested some of the Commune's revenue in transactions that ended in losses. In 1330 he nevertheless held a higher office in Venice: R. Cessi and P. Sambin, *Le deliberazioni del Consiglio dei Rogati (Senato), Serie mixtorum*, vol. 1 (Venice, 1960), 427, XIII, §184.

¹⁰⁸ *DVL* 1: 134.

¹⁰⁹ Ed. Thiriet, *Délibérations*, 1: 305, no. 400.

¹¹⁰ Cessi and Sambin, *Deliberazioni*, 1: 352, X, §320. For the identity of the *bailo*, see Maltezou, *Ὁ θεσμός*, 110.

¹¹¹ Cessi and Sambin, *Deliberazioni*, 1: 285, VIII, §30.

with insufficient space. As a result, the merchants were compelled to rent dwellings at their own cost, sometimes poor-quality and foul-smelling houses belonging to fishermen and other low-ranking individuals.¹¹² In 1332 Andronikos III agreed to pay compensation for the expenses incurred by visiting merchants because the imperial authorities in Thessalonike had failed to allot houses for them to the Venetian consul.¹¹³ From the evidence just mentioned it is clear that these were not necessarily the same houses each time. As for the Venetian settlers, in the absence of adequate evidence it is impossible to determine whether they all resided in the same urban section, nor where the latter was located. In short, it is unclear whether there was any permanent Venetian neighborhood in Thessalonike in the Palaiologan era.

The volume and nature of Venetian trade and presence in Thessalonike in that period were closely related to the city's evolving function within the larger context of long-distance commerce and navigation. This function was affected by several factors. A major one was the substantial intensification of western trade in the Black Sea after the Byzantine recovery of Constantinople in 1261.¹¹⁴ To be sure, transportation costs from the Black Sea to Venice were heavier than from Thessalonike, and periods of crisis, tension, and armed conflict temporarily disrupted or interrupted the flow of goods from that region.¹¹⁵ Nevertheless, it appears that on the whole the Black Sea offered a more abundant, stable, and varied response to the growing Italian demand for grain and raw materials for the expanding cotton and silk industries in Italy.¹¹⁶ Moreover, from the 1280s to the 1340s the

¹¹² DVL 1: 164, 166, 167–68, and 134, a detailed list compiled by Marco Celsi, consul in Thessalonike from 1316 to 1318. On this consul, see above, pp. 101–2. On the issue of compensation, see DVL 1: 146, 159. On Byzantine officials in trade, see also Jacoby, “The Byzantine Outsider in Trade,” 141; Makris, *Studien*, 252–56.

¹¹³ DVL 1: 230–31: *pro satisfactione domorum debitarum secundum formam tregarum ipsarum consuli comunis Veneciarum esistenti in Thessallonichi (sic!), quas non habuit ut debebat*.

¹¹⁴ Since the present paper is not directly concerned with this issue, it will suffice to cite only a few studies among the numerous ones dealing with it: Thiriet, *Romanie vénitienne*; M. Balard, *La Romanie génoise (XIIe–début du XVe siècle)*, BEFAR 235 (Rome, 1978); idem, “Gênes et la mer Noire (XIIIe–XVe siècles),” *RH* 270 (1983): 31–52, repr. in idem, *La mer Noire*, no. V; idem, “Byzance et les régions septentrionales de la mer Noire (XIIIe–XVe siècles),” *RH* 288 (1993): 19–38; K.-P. Matschke, “Zum Charakter des byzantinischen Schwarzmeerhandels im 13. bis 15. Jahrhundert,” *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Leipzig* 19 (1970): 447–58; N. Oikonomidès, *Hommes d'affaires grecs et latins à Constantinople (XIIIe–XVe siècles)* (Montréal–Paris, 1979); Laiou-Thomadakis, “The Byzantine Economy,” 177–222; S. P. Karpov, *L'impero di Trebisonda, Venezia, Genova e Roma, 1204–1461. Rapporti politici, diplomatici, commerciali* (Rome, 1986); idem, *La navigazione veneziana nel Mar Nero, XIII–XV sec.* (Ravenna, 2000). See also next note.

¹¹⁵ See S. Karpov, “[The] Black Sea and the Crisis of the Mid XIVth Century: An Underestimated Turning Point,” *Thesaurismata* 27 (1997): 65–77.

¹¹⁶ On the importance of the Venetian grain trade in the Black Sea, see the previous two notes and Chrysostomides, “Venetian Commercial Privileges,” 316–26. M. Balard, “Le commerce du blé en mer Noire (XIIIe–XVe siècles),” in *Aspetti della vita economica medievale. Atti del convegno di Studi nel X Anniversario della morte di Federico Melis* (Florence, 1985), 17–23, repr. in Balard, *La mer Noire et la Romanie génoise*, no. VI. On cotton: M. F. Mazzaoui, *The Italian Cotton Industry in the Later Middle Ages, 1100–1600* (Cambridge, 1981), 23, 40, 43–44. On silk: D. Jacoby, “Genoa, Silk Trade and Silk Manufacture in the Mediterranean Region (ca. 1100–1300),” in A. R. Calderoni Masetti, C. Di Fabio, and M. Marcenaro, eds., *Tessuti, oreficerie, miniature in Liguria, XIII–XV secolo*, Istituto internazionale di Studi liguri, Atti dei Convegni 3 (Bordighera, 1999), 27–28; L. Molà, *La comunità dei Lucchesi a Venezia. Immigrazione e industria della seta nel tardo medioevo*, Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti. Memorie, Classe di Scienze Morali, Lettere ed Arti 53 (Venice, 1994), 159–60, 208–10, 214–18; on colorants, see also D. Cardon, “Du ‘verme cremexe’ au ‘veluto chremesino’: Une filière vénitienne du cramoisi au XVe siècle,” in L. Molà, R. C. Mueller, and C. Zanier, eds., *La seta in Italia dal Medioevo al Seicento. Dal baco al drappo* (Venice, 2000), 63–73.

Black Sea was also a source of spices and other precious oriental commodities.¹¹⁷ It is highly significant that the Venetian state galleys sailing from Venice to that region, a transportation line inaugurated in 1301, entirely bypassed Thessalonike. The galleys anchored on the way at Negroponte, proceeded on the shortest possible course across the Aegean to Constantinople and the Black Sea, their ultimate destination, and followed the reverse itinerary on the home journey.¹¹⁸ The navigation route followed by these ships provides a clear indication that Thessalonike's role in long-distance traffic began to decline as early as the second half of the thirteenth century.

This role was further restricted by fourteenth-century political and military developments in Thessalonike proper and in its Balkan hinterland.¹¹⁹ The presence of the Catalan Company in Macedonia from the summer of 1307 to the spring of 1309, the civil wars of the fourteenth century within the empire, the Serbian conquests of the 1340s and 1350s, and the Turkish raids beginning in the 1370s impaired Thessalonike's role as entrepôt and market. At times the exploitation of the Macedonian hinterland and the flow of goods from the Balkans were severely reduced, became irregular, or were even interrupted. To be sure, a large quantity of grain was exported from Thessalonike to Ragusa in 1339,¹²⁰ and between 1355 and 1357 the city still benefited from the produce of Chalkidike, whether grain, cotton, or silk.¹²¹ Yet from 1341 onward it became increasingly dependent upon grain imports by sea.¹²² In 1350, during the empire's war with King Dušan of Serbia, John VI requested Venetian grain deliveries.¹²³ In the following decades villages around Thessalonike were devastated and largely emptied by Turkish military operations. Murad I repopulated the countryside with Muslims from northwestern Anatolia in 1385, and Bayazid I acted similarly in 1393.¹²⁴ Early fifteenth-century land cultivation close to Thessalonike and in the Chalkidike peninsula, even when continuous for short periods of time, was mainly directed toward local consumption and not sufficient to uphold the function of Thessalonike as a major outlet of Balkan produce. This is also illustrated by the fairs held in the city or in its vicinity, most of them small, judging by the fiscal rev-

¹¹⁷ Balard, "Gênes et la mer Noire," 31–52.

¹¹⁸ See D. Stöckly, *Le système de l'incanto des galées du marché à Venise (fin XIIIe–milieu XVe siècle)* (Leiden, 1995), 101–19.

¹¹⁹ On the Balkan trade, see K. Dieterich, "Zur Kulturgeographie und Kulturgeschichte des byzantinischen Balkanhandel," *BZ* 31 (1931): 37–57; more specifically, on the orientations of Thessalonike's trade with the Balkans, A. Laiou, "Η Θεσσαλονίκη, ἡ ἐνδοχώρα της καὶ ὁ οἰκονομικός της χῶρος στὴν ἐποχὴ τῶν Παλαιολόγων," in *Διεθνὲς Συμπόσιο Βυζαντινὴ Μακεδονία, 324–1430 μ.Χ. (Θεσσαλονίκη 29–31 Οκτωβρίου 1992)* (Thessalonike, 1995), 184–87, 193–94.

¹²⁰ B. Krekić, *Dubrovnik (Raguse) et le Levant au moyen âge* (Paris–The Hague, 1961), 194–95, no. 186; Laiou, "Η Θεσσαλονίκη," 187–88.

¹²¹ According to a Greek account book: P. Schreiner, ed., *Texte zur spätbyzantinischen Finanz- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte in Handschriften der Bibliotheca Vaticana*, ST 344 (Vatican City, 1991), 79–106, no. 3; dating and siting, *ibid.*, 80–81.

¹²² Not exclusively, however, as stated by Laiou, "Η Θεσσαλονίκη," 189–90. See previous note.

¹²³ Text in Chrysostomides, "Venetian Commercial Privileges," 333.

¹²⁴ For the Ottoman sources, see V. Dimitriades, "Ottoman Chalkidiki: an Area in Transition," in A. Bryer and H. Lowry, eds., *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society* (Birmingham–Washington, D.C., 1982), 41–43; S. Vryonis, Jr., "The Ottoman Conquest of Thessaloniki in 1430," *ibid.*, 298, based on Ioannes Anagnostes, *Διήγησις περὶ τῆς τελευταίας ἀλώσεως τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης. Μονοδία ἐπὶ τῇ ἀλώσει τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης*, ed. G. Tsaras (Thessalonike, 1958), 62; J. Lefort, "Population et peuplement en Macédoine orientale, IXe–XVe siècle," in V. Kravari, J. Lefort, and C. Morrisson, eds., *Hommes et richesses dans l'Empire byzantin* (Paris, 1989–91), 2: 75–82.

enue they yielded.¹²⁵ Moreover, when Thessalonike was cut off from its hinterland as a result of civil wars or foreign conquests, it also lost its centrality as regional administrative center.

It is clear, then, that Thessalonike's maritime function suffered from increasing contraction in the Palaiologan period. To be sure, its sea traffic with Constantinople was furthered to some extent by political instability in the Balkans and the dangers along the Via Egnatia after the outbreak of the second civil war in 1341.¹²⁶ Yet Thessalonike ceased to be a major port of call and transshipment station and was relegated to a secondary role within the framework of trans-Mediterranean traffic. It operated mainly within the short- and medium-range trade and transportation networks of the Aegean region which connected it to Constantinople, Chios, and Negroponte.¹²⁷ It is this city which replaced Thessalonike as major transit station in the western Aegean, in which goods were collected for export to more distant destinations or for distribution in the region. This important and decisive shift has been entirely overlooked until now.¹²⁸

The primacy of Negroponte over Thessalonike within the trans-Mediterranean trade system is illustrated by the nature of trade and traffic between the two cities, recorded in the Venetian claims lists of 1278 and the early 1320s, already mentioned earlier.¹²⁹ On their outbound voyage, Venice's state galleys and private ships sailing to Constantinople unloaded Western woolens and other commodities at Negroponte and there collected cargo on their return journey.¹³⁰ The goods intended for Thessalonike financed the purchase of grain, cotton, silk, and wax, the main exports from the city according to two contemporary trade manuals, the Venetian *Zibaldone da Canal*, completed in the 1320s at the latest, and the Florentine manual of Francesco Balducci Pegolotti, compiled in the following decade.¹³¹ Growing Western demand may have stimulated the expansion of cotton and silk cultivation in Macedonia in the late thirteenth and in the fourteenth centuries.¹³²

¹²⁵ On land cultivation and fairs, see A. Harvey, "Economic Conditions in Thessaloniki between the Two Ottoman Occupations," in A. Cowan, ed., *Mediterranean Urban Culture, 1400–1700* (Exeter, 2000), 118–21. For the sake of comparison, see 14th-century fairs of varying importance in the Peloponnese: Jacoby, "Changing Economic Patterns," 214–15.

¹²⁶ See N. Oikonomides, "The Medieval Via Egnatia," in E. Zachariadou, ed., *The Via Egnatia under Ottoman Rule (1380–1699)*, Halcyon Days in Crete 2 (Rethymnon, 1996), 14–16.

¹²⁷ On the first two destinations, see also below, p. 106.

¹²⁸ By Thiriet, *Romanie vénitienne*, 282, 339–41, as well as by more recent studies.

¹²⁹ See above, pp. 96–97, 102. The list of the early 1320s enumerates merchants residing in Negroponte who had been attacked by pirates based in Thessalonike, Skopelos, and Smyrna, which implies navigation in the Aegean. Their destinations are not stated, yet most likely were Thessalonike, as we may indirectly gather from a specific case in which Constantinople is mentioned: *DVL* 1: 183, 185.

¹³⁰ Resolutions of the Venetian Senate on 20 May 1344 and 4 June 1345 illustrating the role of the state galleys in that traffic: Baron Blanc, ed., *Le flotte mercantili dei Veneziani* (Venice, 1896), 114 and 122–23.

¹³¹ A. Stussi, ed., *Zibaldone da Canal. Manoscritto mercantile del sec. XIV*, *Fonti per la storia di Venezia*, Sez. V, *Fondi vari* (Venice, 1967), 69; Pegolotti, *La pratica della mercatura*, 93, 153, 203. The export of kermes, an expensive dyestuff, is documented later: see below, note 156.

¹³² Mazzaoui, *Italian Cotton Industry*, 43, refers only to cotton exports in the 15th century. Yet evidence on cotton cultivation in Chalkidike appears in the account book compiled between 1355 and 1357, mentioned earlier: Schreiner, *Texte*, 85, no. 3, line 69; commentary, *ibid.*, 102–3. For later evidence, see below, p. 108. The trade manuals just mentioned provide indirect evidence about silk production in the hinterland of Thessalonike. This production is also documented in the 1280s, the 1350s and the 1380s: see respectively below, p. 114, above, p. 104, and below, p. 114. K.-P. Matschke, "Tuchproduktion und Tuchproduzenten in Thessalonike und in anderen Städten und Regionen des späten Byzanz," *Buζavriaká* 9 (1989): 68–84, *passim*, refers to the

Venetian traders and especially the owners and operators of small private ships based in Negroponte were the main, though not the only, beneficiaries of the growing traffic between their city and Thessalonike. Indeed, in 1343 we also find Greeks from both Negroponte and Thessalonike jointly owning a *griparia*, which in all likelihood had previously been involved in traffic between their respective cities.¹³³ The small vessels from Negroponte occasionally carried Greek merchants and their goods. In 1316 some of these Greeks were robbed of their cargo, worth the substantial sum of 8,000 hyperpera, and in addition were seized and sold into slavery. Other Greek merchants from Thessalonike were not paid for goods delivered to Venetians, who presumably had carried them to Negroponte.¹³⁴ The important role of the Venetians settled in this city in trade with Thessalonike, their acquaintance with conditions in the latter, and their interests there account for the occasional choice of consuls from their midst, mentioned above.

There were also ships sailing between Venice and Thessalonike. After 1335 they are regularly mentioned with respect to the timetable of their return voyage and the obligation of the merchants to present their goods before departure to the consul posted in the city. The references to that practice are particularly precious since they continue during the Zealot revolution, which lasted from 1342 to 1349.¹³⁵ It follows that Venetian traders and settlers pursued their activity in Thessalonike in these years. The seizure and destruction of property occurring there were directed only against specific members of the city's social and economic elite. They did not affect the Church's assets nor foreigners, as illustrated by our documents. The city's economy maintained some degree of vitality, despite restrictions imposed by the simultaneous civil war. Industrial production, including the manufacturing of textiles, trade, the movement of ships in Thessalonike's harbor, as well as medium-range traffic with Negroponte, Chios, and Constantinople continued.¹³⁶ There were also Greek pirates operating out of Thessalonike.¹³⁷

In the following years Turkish pirates often endangered the small vessels engaged in transportation between Negroponte and Thessalonike. In 1359 several merchants of Venice accustomed to send their woollens and other goods to Thessalonike via Negroponte demanded that their cargo be carried from that port on board the state galley protecting Euboea, in return for the payment of a freight charge. The request was granted, provided the vessel was not required for naval operations. The following year the Venetian Senate

production of silk and silk textiles in Macedonia and Thessalonike in the Palaiologan period. I shall return elsewhere to that topic.

¹³³ The small ship was sold in 1343 to a Venetian residing in Modon: A. Nanetti, ed., *Documenta veneta Coronii & Methoni rogata. Euristica e critica documentaria per gli oculi capitales Communis Veneciarum (secoli XIV e XV)*, vol. 1, Fondazione Nazionale Ellenica delle Ricerche, Istituto di Ricerche Bizantine, Fonti 3 (Athens, 1999), 110–11, no. 1.111.

¹³⁴ *DVL* 1: 127; the dating is based on the indiction year.

¹³⁵ References for the years 1340–45 in Thiriet, "Vénitiens à Thessalonique," 328 and note 3; Blanc, *Flotte mercantili*, 80, 86, 96, 106, 119.

¹³⁶ K.-P. Matschke, "Thessalonike und die Zeloten. Bemerkungen zu einem Schlüsselereignis der spätbyzantinischen Stadt- und Reichsgeschichte," *BSI* 55 (1994): 30–38. On textiles produced in Thessalonike in that period, see below, pp. 115–16. In view of Thessalonike's direct links with Constantinople, oriental goods could reach the former either directly or via Negroponte or Chios. Golden Horde ceramics were inserted in the Vlatadon monastery of Thessalonike between ca. 1350 and 1370: see H. Philon, "Thessaloniki, Andalusia and the Golden Horde," *BalkSt* 26 (1985): 299–303, 307–20.

¹³⁷ See Matschke, "Thessalonike und die Zeloten," 34 and note 95.

fixed the freight of these goods in order to prevent any overcharge.¹³⁸ The arrangement was still in force in 1374.¹³⁹ We do not know how long it was implemented, yet it had ceased to be by 1407.¹⁴⁰ Incidentally, it is clear that the western woolens brought by Venetians to Thessalonike were not exclusively intended for local consumption and must have been partly reexported further inland, as noted earlier with respect to Melnik.¹⁴¹ It is likely that their continuous import on a fairly large scale, more than any other factor, prevented the development of a large and sophisticated woolen industry in Thessalonike, similar to that operating in the city in the early Ottoman period.¹⁴² The local manufacture of woolens and mixed fabrics in the Palaiologan period appears to have been restricted to medium- and low-grade products and carried out on a fairly limited scale.¹⁴³

The presence and activity of Venetians in Thessalonike is further attested in the 1360s and 1370s. In 1363 Venice envisaged that all its citizens and subjects, settlers included, would leave the empire with their goods, should Emperor John V refuse to ratify a new treaty agreed upon by his ambassadors and fail to rescind new measures damaging Venetian interests. It is noteworthy that Constantinople and Thessalonike are the only cities specifically mentioned in that decree.¹⁴⁴ The presence of a Venetian consul and Venetian settlers in Thessalonike is also attested by a request of 1371 for their intervention in the freeing of an imprisoned Ragusan merchant.¹⁴⁵ In February 1375 the Venetian Senate recorded that the settlers were being harmed by imperial officials.¹⁴⁶

The Ottoman occupation of Thessalonike from 1387 to 1403 ensured anew the regular flow of goods from Macedonia and further regions of the Balkans and must have generated an increase in Venetian trade and presence in the city. Some Venetian merchants were imprisoned in Thessalonike in 1393 and released in the following year, in reprisal for action taken by the Venetian authorities in Negroponte. These had retained a ship loaded with grain and other goods belonging to Thessalonian merchants, in all likelihood Greeks exporting grain from their city rather than importing it.¹⁴⁷ Incidentally, there is good reason to believe that Greek trading in the Aegean was far more intensive than re-

¹³⁸ Thiriet, "Vénitiens à Thessalonique," 330–31 and text 331 note 1. The issue was not protection of the small vessels by the galley, as stated in the summaries of the relevant documents by F. Thiriet, *Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie* (Paris–The Hague, 1958–61), nos. 347 and 361.

¹³⁹ According to a testimony edited by M. Koumanoudi, "'Contra deum, jus et justitiam.' The Trial of Bartolomeo Querini, Bailo and Capitano of Negroponte (14th c.)," in Ch. A. Maltezou, ed., *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII–XV secolo). Atti del Colloquio Internazionale organizzato nel centenario della nascita di Raymond-Joseph Loenertz o.p., Venezia, 1–2 dicembre 2000* (Venice, 2002), 250, 272, §6, lines 18–20: Tommaso Barbarigo and other merchants of Venice *volebant dictam galeam pro mitendo panos Salonichum*.

¹⁴⁰ See below, p. 108.

¹⁴¹ See above, p. 101.

¹⁴² Laiou, "Η Θεσσαλονίκη," 191, considers the lack of proper communication between the city and its hinterland and the resulting lack of wool supplies as one of the main reasons, yet has not taken the imports of finished products into account. On the volume of these imports, see a figure cited below, p. 108.

¹⁴³ Matschke, "Tuchproduktion," 69–76.

¹⁴⁴ Ed. Thiriet, *Délibérations*, 1: 323–24, no. 698: *cives, subditi et mercatores*. In such a context the term *mercatores* was exclusively applied to traveling traders (see above, p. 90), which implies that the two other terms referred to or, in any event, included settlers.

¹⁴⁵ Krekić, *Dubrovnik*, 211, no. 293.

¹⁴⁶ Text in Chrysostomides, "Venetian Commercial Privileges," 347: *Veneti nostri de Salonico molestantur in Salonico per officiales ipsius domini imperatoris*.

¹⁴⁷ Thiriet, *Régestes*, 1: nos. 838 and 857.

flected by the overwhelmingly Western documentation that has survived.¹⁴⁸ Two somewhat later instances of Venetian trading in Ottoman Thessalonike are reported by the lord of Andros, Pietro Zeno, who participated in the negotiations of Gallipoli leading to the treaty of 20 February 1403 between the Ottoman prince Suleyman and several Christian powers.¹⁴⁹ During these negotiations he was approached by a noted merchant from Thessalonike involved in intensive trading with Negroponte, who claimed to be a Venetian citizen.¹⁵⁰ More likely, though, this individual called Agançi was a naturalized Venetian. His strange surname may be a distortion of Γανήτης or Γανίτης, due to a Venetian scribe unfamiliar with Greek names.¹⁵¹ Agançi mentioned that the goods of Ordelaſſo Falier, who seems to have resided in Venice, had been confiscated when he died soon after arriving in Thessalonike. The local Turkish authorities claimed that the safe-conduct he had obtained was valid only during his lifetime. Agançi estimated the value of the goods at between 2,000 and 3,000 ducats.¹⁵² The case had not yet been settled by 1407, when Jacopo Loredan was instructed to request 4,000 ducats as compensation from Prince Suleyman.¹⁵³ Regardless of whether we adopt the lower or higher figure, the sum invested in that single trading venture implies fairly large Venetian business operations in Thessalonike in the first period of Ottoman rule over the city.

Venetian exports of cotton from Thessalonike appear to have been routine in these years, both before and immediately after the renewal of Byzantine dominion over the city in 1403. As it had often done in the past, Venice extended several times the period of the year during which cotton could be brought to Venice, in 1406 because of lack of ships and unfavorable political circumstances.¹⁵⁴ The safety of the vessels sailing between Negroponte and Thessalonike was again discussed in 1407. It was decided then that the Euboea galley should accompany these vessels, be allowed to carry gold and silver, and remain in Thessalonike no more than four full days. If the amount of goods was small, the galley would be replaced by a *galeota*, a medium-sized oared ship of the galley type.¹⁵⁵ Another proposal, which was rejected, envisaged the transportation of woolens brought from Venice on board the galley, provided four hundred pieces of cloth or more were shipped, as well as gold and silver, with a stop at Thessalonike for two days only.¹⁵⁶ From the reference to the four hundred pieces we may gather that the volume of woolens imported to the city in a single season was generally larger. The figure is worthy of attention.

¹⁴⁸ See above, p. 106, on Greek merchants from Thessalonike at an earlier period, and Matschke, "Thessalonike und die Zeloten," 33–36, on their importance in the 1340s.

¹⁴⁹ On this treaty, see below, p. 120.

¹⁵⁰ Ed. of Zeno's report by G. Dennis, S. J., "The Byzantine-Turkish Treaty of 1403," *OCP* 33 (1967): 83–84, §6, repr. in idem, *Byzantium and the Franks, 1350–1420* (London, 1982), no. VI.

¹⁵¹ The two Greek surnames are listed in *PLP*, respectively nos. 3543 and 91593.

¹⁵² Dennis, "Byzantine-Turkish Treaty," 83–84, §§6–7, where Ordelaſſo Falier is described as being young. He should not be confused, therefore, with a namesake and contemporary in charge of the Venetian arsenal at Candia in 1402: F. Thiriet, ed., *Duca di Candia. Ducali e lettere ricevute (1358–1360; 1401–1405)*, *Fonti per la storia di Venezia*, Sez. I, Archivi pubblici (Venice, 1978), no. 25.

¹⁵³ Thiriet, *Régestes*, 2: no. 1243.

¹⁵⁴ K. N. Sathas, ed., *Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire de la Grèce au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1890–1900), 2: 131, 135, 161, 219–20, 226, 257, 267, respectively nos. 357, 364, 395, 460, 472, 520, 533.

¹⁵⁵ On the *galeota*, see J. H. Pryor, *Geography, Technology and War. Studies in the Maritime History of the Mediterranean, 649–1571* (Cambridge, 1988), 66–67; Balard, *Romanie génoise*, 552.

¹⁵⁶ Sathas, *Documents*, 2: 175–76, no. 410. Silk and kermes are also mentioned in the same context, yet these commodities were obviously exported from Thessalonike.

The two proposals of 1407 offer confirmation about some of the goods handled in Thessalonike by Venetians, yet also provide new evidence of special interest in this respect. The reference to gold and silver hints at Venetian business ventures connected with the operations of Serbian and Greek merchants between the city and the Serbian mining center of Novo Brdo, beginning in the 1370s.¹⁵⁷ By 1407 Thessalonike had become a bullion market in which Venetians exchanged their gold ducats for silver, which was shipped to areas using silver-based currencies, as we may gather from somewhat later evidence.¹⁵⁸ There is ample evidence about the dispatch of silver bullion from Venice on board state galleys sailing eastward from the 1320s onward.¹⁵⁹ In Venice the silver trade was closely supervised by government officials.¹⁶⁰ This was apparently not the case, at least not to the same extent, in Byzantine Thessalonike. It is likely, therefore, that silver could be bought there at lower prices, provided the bullion market was closely monitored by merchants and bankers. Venetian settlers were instrumental in that respect, in view of their continuous presence in the city and their activity as local agents, which furthered the interests of traveling merchants. Venetian settlers are again directly attested in Thessalonike in 1418. Bertuccio Diedo, Venetian *bailo* in Constantinople, introduced new taxes on their goods, presumably during a vacancy in the consul's office. On 15 January 1419 he was ordered to cancel them.¹⁶¹

Two Venetian citizens, the Greek brothers Giorgio and Demetrio Filomati (Φιλομάτης in Greek), were deeply involved in the affairs of Thessalonike in the first decades of the fifteenth century. They are worthy of particular attention, in view of both their functions and their ethnic identity.¹⁶² It was apparently their father who emigrated before 1400 from Candia to Venice, where he obtained full Venetian citizenship, only seldom awarded to Greeks. The family nevertheless remained faithful to the Greek Church. In 1418 or somewhat earlier Venice elected Giorgio Filomati as consul in Thessalonike. For some unknown reason he was ejected from that position in 1418 by the *bailo* in Constantinople, Bertuccio Diedo, yet was reinstated in it by a resolution of the Venetian Senate, adopted on 15 January 1419 at the request of his brother Demetrio.¹⁶³ Giorgio drowned in the vicinity of Negroponte in the autumn of 1422 and was succeeded as Venetian consul by Demetrio, who served in that office until Venice occupied Thessalonike on 13 September of the following

¹⁵⁷ See K.-P. Matschke, "Zum Anteil der Byzantiner an der Bergbauentwicklung und an den Bergbauerträgen Südosteuropas im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert," *BZ* 84–85 (1991–92): 57–65.

¹⁵⁸ Matschke, *ibid.*, 64, is somewhat hesitant about bullion and speaks of a money market, yet Venetian merchants did not export silver coins: see below, p. 111.

¹⁵⁹ F. C. Lane and R. C. Mueller, *Money and Banking in Medieval and Renaissance Venice*, vol. 1, *Coins and Monies of Account* (Baltimore, Md.–London, 1985), 365–71; R. C. Mueller, *The Venetian Money Market: Banks, Panics and the Public Debt, 1200–1500* (Baltimore, Md., 1997), 84, 137, 162, 446.

¹⁶⁰ Lane and Mueller, *Money and Banking*, 152–60; Mueller, *Venetian Money Market*, 193.

¹⁶¹ Thiriet, *Régestes*, 2: no. 1725. Bertuccio Diedo was appointed *bailo* in Constantinople in 1418: see Maltezou, *Ὁ θεσμός*, 121.

¹⁶² For what follows on the Filomati family, see D. Jacoby, "I Greci ed altre comunità fra Venezia ed oltremare," in M. F. Tiepolo and E. Tonetti, eds., *I Greci a Venezia: Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studio, Venezia, 5–7 novembre 1998*, Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti (Venice, 2002), 57–59. I use here the Italian version of the brothers' names. They were not naturalized Venetians, as I mistakenly stated in Jacoby, "Vénitiens naturalisés," 225–26, but full citizens.

¹⁶³ Thiriet, *Régestes*, 2: no. 1725. The action of the *bailo* against Giorgio caused the vacancy in the consul's office mentioned above.

year.¹⁶⁴ Interestingly, on 3 February 1431, thus less than one year after the Turkish conquest of the city on 29 March 1430, Demetrio was sent anew as consul to Thessalonike, apparently at his own request. As stated on that occasion, the presence of a consul was indispensable for the activity of the Venetians in the city.¹⁶⁵

It is clear that both brothers had traded with Thessalonike before 1419 and took advantage of their official function to further their commercial interests in the city. Their jointly owned ship sank in 1422 with Giorgio on board while sailing on a trading venture to Thessalonike. Early in 1423 Demetrio brought an action for 1,000 ducats against the insurers of the ship, because they refused to honor their obligations.¹⁶⁶ We may safely assume that Thessalonike's insertion within the wide commercial network of the family continued beyond the Turkish occupation of the city in 1430.¹⁶⁷ The election of these Greeks who were Venetian citizens as consuls in Thessalonike was presumably motivated by the conjunction of two factors: the interest of Latins in the office may have reached a low point just before and just after the Venetian occupation of Thessalonike, and the Greeks had the advantage of better linguistic access to local traders.

In 1423 the despot Andronikos Palaiologos, who ruled over Thessalonike, offered the city to Venice on behalf of the city's population. The proposal was transmitted to the Venetian *bailo* of Euboea, who entrusted Andreas of Nauplia, a Greek resident of Negroponte, to convey it to Venice. Significantly, the Thessalonians bypassed Demetrio Filomati, who was acting as Venetian consul in Thessalonike at that time, as noted above, which proves once more the relatively low standing of his office in the Venetian administrative hierarchy overseas. Andreas of Nauplia must have conducted business with Thessalonike, since the Venetian Senate consulted him about the state of affairs in the city before reaching a decision.¹⁶⁸ Four additional individuals were also requested to offer their advice.¹⁶⁹ One of them was Giorgio Valaresso, who apparently resided in Venice. In the year following Venice's occupation of Thessalonike he was involved there in the import of wheat and barley from Crete on behalf of the government, which reimbursed him in February of the following year.¹⁷⁰ It is likely that he had privately carried out similar operations before 1423, which would explain why he was called to the Senate. Francesco di Benedetto Trevisan imported woollens and conducted other business in Constantinople in the years 1437–39, as revealed by the account book of the Venetian Giacomo Badoer, who operated there at that time.¹⁷¹ He too must have engaged in the early 1420s in trade with Thessalonike, which he probably used as a stopover on the way from Venice to further destinations. These three

¹⁶⁴ Thiriet, *Régestes*, 2: no. 1863, and 3: no. 2225. Contrary to Thiriet, "Vénitiens à Thessalonique," 332 note 2, the brothers did not receive lifelong appointments to the office of consul. Dating of the Venetian takeover by P. Schreiner, *Die byzantinische Kleinchroniken*, CFHB 12 (Vienna, 1975–79), 2: 423–24.

¹⁶⁵ Thiriet, *Régestes*, 3: no. 2225. Dating of the Turkish conquest by Barker, *Manuel II*, 374.

¹⁶⁶ See B. Imhaus, *Le minoranze orientali a Venezia, 1300–1510* (Rome, 1997), 108. The reconstruction of the case presented here is mine. The ship was known to have sunk by December 1422: see Thiriet, *Régestes*, 2: no. 1863. As noted earlier, Giorgio drowned precisely in that year.

¹⁶⁷ On the family's trading in that period, see above, note 162.

¹⁶⁸ Sathas, *Documents*, 1: 133.21–134.7, no. 86; in 135.37–38 he is mentioned as *fidelem nostrum et civem Nigropontis*.

¹⁶⁹ Thiriet, *Régestes*, 2: no. 1891.

¹⁷⁰ Thiriet, *Régestes*, 2: no. 1967.

¹⁷¹ U. Dorini and T. Bertelè, eds., *Il libro dei conti di Giacomo Badoer (Costantinopoli, 1436–1440)*, II Nuovo Ramusio 3 (Rome, 1956), 111, line 35; 484, line 28; 767, lines 8–10.

cases provide additional illustrations of the range of Venetian trade with Thessalonike on the eve of the Venetian period.¹⁷²

The six and a half years of Venetian rule, from September 1423 to March 1430, witnessed an increase in the Venetian presence in the city. In addition to Venetian officials there was also a garrison, composed of Venetian and foreign men of arms. In 1425 the Greeks of Thessalonike complained about their behavior.¹⁷³ On the other hand, the presence of the Roman Church remained modest, in contrast to its intrusion during the twenty years of Latin domination following the Fourth Crusade. Venice had promised in 1423 to maintain the local municipal institutions and privileges, as well as the status of the Orthodox Church and its clergy. Although it severely reduced the operation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, it was careful to maintain good relations with the Greek archbishop Symeon.¹⁷⁴ When the latter died in 1429, some six months before the fall of Thessalonike to the Turks, he was deeply mourned by the entire population, including the Latins, according to the *Diegesis* of John Anagnostes.¹⁷⁵

The Venetian mercantile activity and presence must have been reinforced by Venetian rule over Thessalonike and the city's complete dependence upon Venetian grain supplies, brought in by sea from various regions.¹⁷⁶ Some settlers, who had previously limited themselves to the wholesale of woolens, intruded into the retail trade at the expense of local Greek merchants. At the latter's request the Venetian government reaffirmed in 1425 their exclusive right to that activity at the customary location.¹⁷⁷ The three Thessalonian traders who in 1426 bought grain in Crete and shipped it to their city were presumably Venetian settlers.¹⁷⁸ Significantly, it is only within the period of Venetian occupation, more precisely from 1424 to 1430, that the state galleys sailing between Venice and the Black Sea anchored at Thessalonike.¹⁷⁹ In 1428 and 1429 Guglielmo Querini entrusted respectively 200 and 450 gold ducats to a merchant sailing on such a galley, who was ordered to buy silver at Thessalonike and deliver it to Guglielmo's brother at Trebizond. In 1430 the latter took along woolens on a private ship to make similar purchases in Thessalonike.¹⁸⁰ It

¹⁷² The two other individuals, Pietro Querini and Pietro Zeno *maior*, cannot be securely identified among several contemporary namesakes. One may wonder, though, whether Pietro Querini was the individual residing in Crete who in 1429 obtained a license for the extraction of alum in that island: see D. Jacoby, "L'alun et la Crète vénitienne," *ByzF* 12 (1987): 131–33, repr. in idem, *Trade, Commodities and Shipping*, no. X. In any event, it is clear that he was also engaging in other business ventures.

¹⁷³ Archivio di Stato di Venezia (hereafter ASV), Senato, Misti, reg. 55, fol. 141v., §13: *i cavalieri del ducha e del capetano* were horsemen and not gentlemen, as in K. M. Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant (1204–1571)*, vol. 2, *The Fifteenth Century* (Philadelphia, 1978), 24. A facsimile reproduction of the entire document appears in K. D. Mertziou, *Μνημεία μακεδονικής ιστορίας* (Thessalonike, 1947), after p. 48.

¹⁷⁴ Sathas, *Documents*, 1: 133.26–34, 135.32–136.1, 137.33–138.33, no. 86. See D. Balfour, *Politico-Historical Works of Symeon, Archbishop of Thessalonica (1416/17 to 1429). Critical Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*, WByzSt 13 (Vienna, 1979), 168–72. On the nature of some local privileges, see E. Patlagean, "L'immunité des Thessaloniciens," in *ΕΥΨΥΧΙΑ. Mélanges offerts à Hélène Ahrweiler*, Byzantina Sorbonensia 16 (Paris, 1998), 1: 591–601, esp. 599. On the whole issue, see D. Jacoby, "Thessalonique de la domination de Byzance à celle de Venise. Continuité, adaptation ou rupture?" *Mélanges Gilbert Dragon* = TM 14 (2002): 303–18.

¹⁷⁵ Ioannes Anagnostes, *Διήγησις*, 10.21–23, §4.

¹⁷⁶ Thiriet, "Vénitiens à Thessalonique," 332; Vryonis, "Ottoman Conquest," 306–8.

¹⁷⁷ ASV, Senato, Misti, reg. 55, fol. 42r. See Jacoby, "Thessalonique," 314–15.

¹⁷⁸ Thiriet, *Délibérations*, 2: no. 1299.

¹⁷⁹ See Stöckly, *Le système de l'incanto*, 103, 112–13.

¹⁸⁰ See G. Luzzatto, *Studi di storia economica veneziana* (Padua, 1954), 177–78.

would seem that these operations were prompted by a rise in the price of certified silver bars in Venice in these same years and the prospect of cheaper purchases in Thessalonike.¹⁸¹ Incidentally, these operations imply that the Turks did not hermetically cut off the city from the Balkan hinterland and its silver mines, as one would assume on the basis of other sources.

A number of Venetians were captured and enslaved by the Turks after the latter's occupation of Thessalonike in 1430. The names of some prominent ones were recorded by the *bailo* of Euboea in his report about the fall of the city and in the instructions approved by the Venetian Senate on 29 April 1430 regarding peace negotiations with the Turks.¹⁸² In addition, these instructions refer to the liberation from captivity of other citizens and subjects (*alii cives et fideles nostri*), obviously Venetian settlers among them. One of these was Ambrogio de Martinengo, scion of a family originating in Brescia, a city under Venetian rule since 1426. It is noteworthy that this individual, who therefore was considered Venetian, had brought his wife and sons to Thessalonike, presumably during the Venetian period. There is good reason to believe that other Venetian merchants had acted similarly. By October 1438 Ambrogio de Martinengo and his wife had been ransomed and were in Italy. Pope Eugenius IV, the Venetian Gabriele Condulmer, intervened then to collect the money needed for the release of their two sons. Presumably somewhat later the pope issued an appeal for funds required for the ransoming of fourteen Greek monks of the monastery of St. Basil in Thessalonike.¹⁸³ It has been suggested that they had recognized papal supremacy after the Council of Florence, held in 1438–39, which would explain the pope's efforts on their behalf.¹⁸⁴

The peace treaty concluded between Murad II and Venice on 4 September 1430, some six months after Thessalonike's occupation, provided that the Venetians would enjoy commercial freedom and customary conditions in the sultan's territories.¹⁸⁵ The treaty does not refer specifically to resident Venetian traders, yet we may safely assume that the dispatch of a consul to Thessalonike in the year following the Turkish conquest was partly motivated by the prospect that some former Venetian residents would return to the city and be joined by new settlers.¹⁸⁶ This indeed occurred in the following years. The presence of Venetian settlers in Thessalonike is expressly stated in a resolution adopted by the Venetian Senate in 1436.¹⁸⁷ In 1438 and 1439 Giacomo di Marin Cocco, who resided in the city, conducted business with the Venetian Giacomo Badoer, who operated in Constantinople as noted above. Together with a relative, Giovanni Cocco, and Niccolò Contarini, both of whom also appear to have been established in Thessalonike, he was involved in 1439 in the

¹⁸¹ On the rise in Venice, see Mueller, *Venetian Money Market*, 189–93.

¹⁸² Respectively in Mertziōs, *Μνημεία*, 92–93, and J. Valentini, *Acta Albaniae Veneta saeculorum XIV et XV* (Palermo–Munich, 1967–), 14: 64–68, no. 3355.

¹⁸³ The first document has been published by N. Iorga, *Notes et extraits pour servir à l'histoire des croisades au XVe siècle* (Paris, 1899–1902), 2: 352. The second document, in Archivio Segreto Vaticano, reg. 270, fol. 245r., is summarized by Mertziōs, *Μνημεία*, 94–95, with facsimile reproduction after 96.

¹⁸⁴ See Janin, "L'Église latine à Thessalonique," 215–16, who, however, does not repeat this suggestion in his later work, *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins (Bithynie, Hellespont, Latros, Galèsios, Trébizonde, Athènes, Thessalonique)* (Paris, 1975), 356.

¹⁸⁵ *DVL* 2: 343–45.

¹⁸⁶ On that consul, see above, p. 109.

¹⁸⁷ Thiriet, *Régestes*, 3: no. 2429, §9.

¹⁸⁸ According to the latter's account book: Dorini and Bertelè, *Il libro dei conti di Giacomo Badoer*, 572, lines 11–12; 650, lines 1–3; 652–53, esp. 652, line 25 (Contarini and Giacomo Cocco *che abita a Salomichi*); 711, lines 8–9.

shipment of salted pork meat to Badoer.¹⁸⁸ In 1454 the Venetian consul in Thessalonike, Bernadotto da Vicenza, was compelled to pay 1,200 ducats levied from resident Venetian merchants, as compensation for goods robbed in the Aegean from an Ottoman subject of the city.¹⁸⁹

Except for a small group of Ottoman officials, there was no sizable clientele for imported goods in Thessalonike in these years, in contrast to the previous period. The city's population consisted mainly of impoverished Greeks who had been redeemed from captivity and of Turks who had been forcibly resettled in the city.¹⁹⁰ The supply of the local market, therefore, was not the main objective of the Venetian residents and of their traveling counterparts. More importantly, they wished to take advantage of the resumption of the city's regular connections with its Balkan hinterland and of the increased flow of commodities from that region, generated by the Ottoman conquest of Thessalonike. However, Serbian silver was not included among these commodities, since it was sent to more active markets, namely Adrianople and Serres.¹⁹¹

We may now turn to the citizens and subjects of other Italian maritime powers and to their activity in Thessalonike in the Palaiologan period. Pisa maintained its quarter, church, and consul in Constantinople after the Byzantine recovery of the city in 1261. Pisans traded in the empire's capital and extended their operations into the Black Sea. This activity is documented as late as 1394, yet was carried out on a small scale.¹⁹² Pisans are also documented in Latin Romania, especially at Chiarenza, the main port of the Frankish Peloponnesos, from the 1270s until the second decade of the fourteenth century. Some of them were possibly settlers.¹⁹³ Thessalonike must have served as port of call for some of the ships sailing between Pisa and Constantinople. Moreover, the Pisan trade manual compiled in 1278 compares the Thessalonian weight used for grain with that of Pisa, which suggests that Pisan merchants were involved around that time in the export of that commodity.¹⁹⁴ Yet there is no direct evidence regarding Pisan activity or presence in Thessalonike in the thirteenth century, except for a pirate based there in the 1270s.¹⁹⁵ The absence of such evidence is clearly due to the massive loss of Pisan notarial charters bearing on the eastern Mediterranean in that period. Yet it must also reflect a general decline of Pisan operations in Byzantium, in contrast to those carried out at that time in other regions of the eastern Mediterranean. It is noteworthy that sources other than notarial charters as well as indirect evidence point to vigorous Pisan trading and shipping with Egypt, the crusader Levant, and the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia until the later thirteenth century.¹⁹⁶

¹⁸⁸ Thiriet, *Régestes*, 3: no. 2959.

¹⁸⁹ See below, p. 122.

¹⁹⁰ See Matschke, "Bergbauentwicklung," 64.

¹⁹¹ See Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, 133–34, 208, 299 and note 94; W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen âge* (Leipzig, 1885–86), 1: 472–73; C. Otten-Froux, "Documents inédits sur les Pisans en Roumanie aux XIIIe–XIVe siècles," in M. Balard, A. E. Laiou, and C. Otten-Froux, *Les Italiens à Byzance*, Byzantina Sorbonensia 6 (Paris, 1987), 159 and 169–70, 177–80, 182–84, 188–91, respectively nos. 3, 9, 11, 12, 16; M. Balard, "I Pisani in Oriente dalla guerra di Acri (1258) al 1406," in *Studi di storia pisana e toscana in onore del prof. Cinzio Violante = Bollettino storico pisano* 60 (1991): 6–8.

¹⁹² See Jacoby, "Changing Economic Patterns," 227.

¹⁹³ R. Lopez and G. Airaldi, eds., "Il più antico manuale italiano di pratica della mercatura," in *Miscellanea di studi storici*, vol. 2, Collana storica di fonti e studi diretta da G. Pitarino 38 (Genoa, 1983), 120, line 1.

¹⁹⁴ See above, p. 97 and note 75.

¹⁹⁵ See D. Jacoby, "Pisa e l'Oriente crociato," in G. Garzella and M. L. Ceccarelli Lemut, eds., "*Pisani viri in insulis et transmarinis regionibus potentes*." *Pisa come nodo di comunicazioni nei secoli centrali del medioevo* (Pisa, 2003)

References to exports from Thessalonike to Pisa and Florence, specifically of wax and cotton to the first of these cities, appear in the trade manual of Pegolotti, compiled between 1330 and 1340.¹⁹⁷ A later trade manual of the 1380s, composed by a member or employee of the Datini firm of Prato, refers in addition to the export of grain to Pisa and of silk to Florence.¹⁹⁸ These works hint at Pisan activity in Thessalonike when it was under Ottoman rule, a period witnessing the continuation of Pisan trade in Romania, including in Constantinople, as noted earlier. Florence occupied Pisa in 1406 and replaced it as a Mediterranean maritime power, yet there is no evidence of Florentine merchants in Thessalonike in the following years. The city is not even mentioned in a trade manual composed in 1396 in Genoa by Saminiato de' Ricci and updated until 1424 in Florence by an agent of Giovanni di Bicci de' Medici, considered the founder of the Medici bank.¹⁹⁹ In 1436 Florentine galleys began to sail to Constantinople, yet on the way they anchored at Negroponte and bypassed Thessalonike.²⁰⁰ This pattern of navigation was similar to the one followed by the Venetian state galleys, except from 1424 to 1430.²⁰¹

Genoa was Venice's main rival in the eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea in the Palaiologan period. By the treaty of Nymphaeum, concluded in 1261, Emperor Michael VIII promised Genoa commercial facilities, a church, a bathhouse, and an oven in various localities of the empire. One of them was Kassandreia, at the neck of the Pallene peninsula in the theme of Thessalonike. Thessalonike proper was not included, although it was under the emperor's rule.²⁰² Kassandreia was a minor trading station in which the Genoese were clearly not interested, and there is no evidence that they ever traded or settled there.²⁰³

The documentation regarding Genoese commerce and presence in Palaiologan Thessalonike is extremely meager. A Genoese resident of Negroponte deserted the Venetian ship on which he had served as sailor after its arrival in Thessalonike in 1271. Unpublished

(in press); idem, "The Supply of War Materials to Egypt in the Crusader Period," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 25 (2001): 117, 121–22, 124–25.

¹⁹⁷ Pegolotti, *La pratica della mercatura*, 203.

¹⁹⁸ C. Ciano, ed., *La "pratica di mercatura" datiniana (secolo XIV)* (Milan, 1964), 52. The section of that manual referring to Thessalonike is reproduced in the one completed in 1440 in Florence by Giovanni Uzzano which, therefore, does not offer any new data: G. F. Pagnini del Ventura, *Della decima e di varie altre gravezze imposte dal comune di Firenze* (Lisbon-Lucca, 1765–1766), II, vol. IV, 88. On the relation between the two manuals in that respect, see U. Tucci, "Per un'edizione moderna della pratica di mercatura dell'Uzzano," in *Studi di storia economica toscana nel Medioevo e nel Rinascimento in memoria di Federico Melis*. Biblioteca del "Bollettino Storico Pisano," Collana storica 33 (Ospedalwetto [Pisa], 1987), 380–81.

¹⁹⁹ A. Borlandi, ed., *Il manuale di mercatura di Saminiato de' Ricci* (Genoa, 1963).

²⁰⁰ In 1439 Florence obtained the Pisan loggia and church in Constantinople. See Heyd, *Histoire du commerce*, 2: 298–301; M. E. Mallett, *The Florentine Galleys in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford, 1967), 66–68.

²⁰¹ See above, pp. 103–4, 111.

²⁰² Ed. C. Manfroni, "Le relazioni fra Genova, l'impero bizantino e i Turchi," *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria* 28 (1898): 793, 800; new ed. by S. Dellacasa, *I Libri Iurium della Repubblica di Genova*, vol. 1.4, Fonti per la storia della Liguria 11 (Genoa, 1998), 274, 279, no. 749: *in partibus Salonichi apud Cassandriam*, and in . . . *Cassandria*. See I. Ševčenko, "The Zealot Revolution and the Supposed Genoese Colony in Thessalonica," in *Προσφορά εις Στ. Κυριακίδη* (Thessalonike, 1953), 607–10, repr. in idem, *Society and Intellectual Life in Late Byzantium* (London, 1981), no. III. Several later studies nevertheless cling to the common erroneous interpretation that Genoa was granted assets in Thessalonike proper.

²⁰³ On Kassandreia, see *ODB* 2: 1109, s.v.; J. R. Melville-Jones, "Lixola di Caxandria," *Thesaurismata* 27 (1997): 125–38, esp. 129–37 for the period covered here. A pirate was based at Kassandreia in the 1270s: TTh 3: 205. The city served as operational base for the Catalan Company from the summer of 1307 to the spring of 1309: see Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*, 208–9, 221, 226.

documents drafted in the Italian city of Lucca in 1284 attest to the import of silk from Macedonian Berrhoia (“seta de Veria”), which must have been shipped from Thessalonike and transited to Genoa, the main supplier of raw materials to the Lucchese silk workshops.²⁰⁴ A contract of 1289 mentions the sailing of a Genoese *tarida* from Caffa or Tana in the Black Sea to Chios and Thessalonike.²⁰⁵ Genoa’s requests for compensation submitted to the empire in 1294 mention the confiscation of goods, personal belongings, and money from a group of its traders by the despot of Thessalonike. A sum of 3,684 hyperpera was still outstanding, which implies trade investments on a far larger scale. In another case, the governor’s officials had seized a horse belonging to a Genoese, which seems to imply that he resided in the city, engaged to some extent in land trade, and acted as commercial agent or middleman.²⁰⁶ Additional Genoese commercial investments in Thessalonike are attested between 1277 and 1317. Only fairly intensive trading carried out both by settlers and visiting merchants would account for the presence of a Genoese consul called Cestino Codino in the city in May 1305.²⁰⁷ In 1319 Venice complained that an imperial official in the city had confiscated grain from a Venetian trader and passed it on to a Genoese who was his own friend.²⁰⁸ In 1339 Genoese and merchants from Romania purchased on behalf of Ragusa large quantities of grain in Constantinople and Thessalonike.²⁰⁹ It is unclear, however, whether the Genoese were involved in the operation in the latter city.

It should be noted that the Genoese conducted intensive trading in western Greece from the first half of the thirteenth century onward and that some of them settled in Thebes, Negroponte, and Chiarenza. One of their main incentives was the quest for silk textiles and raw materials used in the latter’s manufacture, namely silk fibers and kermes. Yet the Genoese displayed far less interest in Thessalonike than the Venetians. The latter took advantage of their colonies in western Greece and nearby islands to expand their trade and achieve commercial supremacy in western Romania at the expense of the Genoese and other competitors. This process was also furthered by the Genoese themselves, namely by their focus on commercial expansion in the Black Sea,²¹⁰ as well as by their rule over the island of Chios from 1304 to 1329 and again from 1346 onward, which enhanced the safety of their traffic through the Aegean. The Venetian-Genoese war of 1350–55 generated the definitive shift of their trade and navigation routes from the Balkans and the waterway along the latter’s shore, with stopovers such as Thessalonike, to the central and eastern Aegean. By the mid-fourteenth century the Aegean was divided into two zones,

²⁰⁴ See above, p. 105 and note 132, on silk production in Macedonia.

²⁰⁵ For 1284: Lucca, Archivio di Stato, Notarile, reg. 15, Bartolomeo Fulceri, fol. 370v, 467r; for 1289: M. Balard, ed., *Gênes et Outremer, I. Les actes de Caffa du notaire Lamberto di Sambuceto, 1289–1290* (Paris–The Hague, 1973), 72, no. 28.

²⁰⁶ G. Bertolotto, ed., “Nuova serie di documenti sulle relazioni di Genova con l’Impero bizantino,” *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria* 28 (1897): 512, 531.

²⁰⁷ For the relevant documentation, see Balard, *Romanie génoise*, 164; idem, “The Genoese in the Aegean (1204–1566),” in B. Arbel, B. Hamilton, and D. Jacoby, eds., *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204* (London, 1989), 160. Yet the evidence bearing on Genoese trade in Thessalonike does not stop in 1317, as argued by Balard.

²⁰⁸ *DVL* 1: 134, last clause, the language of which is somewhat confusing. Although the *comerclari* are mentioned in the plural, the transfer is mentioned with respect to a single official.

²⁰⁹ Krekić, *Dubrovnik*, 194–95, no. 186.

²¹⁰ See above, note 117.

one dominated by Genoa and the other by Venice.²¹¹ We may safely assume, therefore, that while Genoese trade and presence in Thessalonike continued, their volume declined and was fairly limited from then on.

The evidence bearing on the Genoese in Thessalonike in subsequent years is extremely meager. In 1349 two Genoese traders concluded in Chios an agreement regarding a certain quantity of linen cloth and fustians produced in Thessalonike, evaluated at some 1,900 hyperpera. We do not know whether they had bought these textiles in the city or whether the latter had been brought to Chios by Thessalonian traders.²¹² In 1410 two Genoese, Giovanni Accursio and Filippo Galea da Finale, resided in Thessalonike after it had reverted to Byzantine rule, the latter traveling on business to Chios.²¹³ In 1425, two years into the Venetian period, the Greek inhabitants demanded that Genoese merchants visiting the city pay commercial taxes, yet the Venetian Senate upheld the exemption which they had enjoyed under Byzantine rule.²¹⁴ The phrasing of both the request and the answer implies that such visits had not been infrequent in the past, when Thessalonike was in Byzantine hands, and that they were expected to continue. Most Genoese trading in the city were presumably based in Chios, the others being merchants passing through that island.

The subjects of the kingdom of Aragon, generally known to the Byzantines as *Katalanoi*, are the last Latin subgroup to be examined here. We have no direct information about them in Thessalonike until the fourteenth century. It stands to reason, though, that some of those who traded in Constantinople in the preceding two centuries stopped on their way in Thessalonike. This warrants some attention to their appearance in the imperial capital. The well-known Jewish traveler Benjamin of Tudela mentions *Sefaradim*, or Spaniards, among the foreign traders he encountered in Constantinople in the early 1160s.²¹⁵ Their activity is confirmed by the grant of a quarter to Spanish and Provençal merchants, which may have been connected with the negotiations conducted between King Alfonso II of Aragon and Emperor Manuel I in the years 1176–80.²¹⁶ The quarter, which lacked direct access to the shore of the Golden Horn, was partly occupied by the

²¹¹ See Jacoby, "Changing Economic Patterns," 223–24, 226–28. There is no evidence that Genoa ever contemplated competing with Venice in Thessalonike and failed in its attempt to support the activity of its citizens in the city, as argued by Balard, "Genoese in the Aegean," 160–61.

²¹² Ph. P. Argenti, *The Occupation of Chios by the Genoese and Their Administration of the Island, 1346–1566* (Cambridge, 1958), 3: 528, no. 47. The textiles were to be shipped to Pera. On this venture, see also Matschke, "Tuchproduktion," 70–72. On maritime trade between Thessalonike and Chios in that period, see above, pp. 105–6. There is no reason to believe that the textiles passed through a transit station, an additional course suggested by Matschke.

²¹³ According to a deposition of 1412, edited by G. G. Musso, *Navigazione e commercio genovese con il Levante nei documenti dell'Archivio di Stato di Genova (Secc. XIV–XV)*, con appendice documentaria a cura di Maria Silvia Jacopino (Rome, 1975), 266–68, no. 24.

²¹⁴ ASV, Senato, Misti, reg. 55, fol. 141r, §10. See Jacoby, "Thessalonique," 316.

²¹⁵ M. N. Adler, ed. and trans., *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela* (New York, 1907), 20 and trans., 12. For the dating of his journey through the empire, see D. Jacoby, "Benjamin of Tudela in Byzantium," in P. Schreiner and O. Strakhov, eds., *Chryse Porta / Zlatiya Vrata: Essays Presented to Ihor Ševčenko on His Eightieth Birthday by His Colleagues and Students* (Cambridge, Mass., 2002) = *Palaeoslavica* 10.1–2 (2002), 180–82.

²¹⁶ On which see E. Marcos Hierro, *Die byzantinisch-katalanischen Beziehungen im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Chronik Jakobs I. von Katalonien-Aragon*, MiscByzMonac 37 (Munich, 1996), 134–38; D. Durant i Duelt, "Una ambaxaida catalana a Constantinoble el 1176 i el matrimoni de la princesa Eudòxia," *Anuario de estudios medievales* 30 (2000): 963–77. However, neither of these two authors refers to the quarter, which is mentioned only in 1224: TTh 2: 255.

Venetians soon after the conquest of Constantinople in 1204, and its division between Venice and the Latin Empire was finalized in 1224.²¹⁷ There is no trace of it at a later date. From these pieces of information we may infer that the commercial and maritime activity of the subjects of Aragon in Constantinople and, more generally, in the empire remained fairly limited until the Palaiologan period.

It clearly expanded under the reign of Emperor Michael VIII. In 1281 the merchants of Barcelona, with the approval of King Peter III of Aragon, appointed one of their own as resident consul in Constantinople. He was to exercise his authority over the king's subjects, whether visiting or settled in Constantinople or elsewhere in the empire.²¹⁸ In 1292 Emperor Andronikos II seized several visiting Catalans and their goods in retaliation for the raids carried out on Byzantine territories by Roger de Lluria, admiral of King Frederick III of Sicily.²¹⁹ At the behest of the Catalan consul in Constantinople, the emperor granted commercial privileges to the subjects of Aragon in 1296.²²⁰ However, the latter's trade with Constantinople was interrupted in 1305 by the outbreak of hostilities between the empire and the Catalan Company, and resumed only sometime before 1316.²²¹ In 1320 Andronikos II granted Catalan merchants a further reduction in trade dues, which suggests an expansion of their activity in the empire, confirmed by some notarial deeds and an account book of 1341–1342.²²² Nevertheless, in the following years of the fourteenth and in the first half of the fifteenth century, they displayed a limited interest in Romania, compared with their heavy investments in trade with the Levant.²²³

Thessalonike occasionally served as a stopover for Catalan traders and ships sailing to Constantinople or Levantine ports or returning from these destinations.²²⁴ These traders were presumably those who imported Spanish ceramics to Thessalonike between ca. 1350 and ca. 1370.²²⁵ In 1370 Catalan merchants carrying woolens manufactured in Barcelona

²¹⁷ See Jacoby, "Venetian Quarter," 163.

²¹⁸ See M. T. Ferrer i Mallol, "Sobre els orígens del Consolat de Mar a Barcelona el 1279 i sobre els cònsols d'Ultramar a bord de vaixells. Un exemple de 1281," *Anuario de estudios medievales* 23 (1993): 144–49; S. P. Bensch, "Early Catalan Contacts with Byzantium," in L. J. Simon, ed., *Iberia and the Mediterranean World of the Middle Ages: Studies in Honor of Robert I. Burns S.J., I. Proceedings from Kalamazoo* (Leiden, 1995), 138–40 and 156–58, doc. 1.

²¹⁹ Letter of James II, king of Aragon, to Roger de Lluria: H. Finke, ed., *Acta aragonensia. Quellen zur deutschen, italienischen, französischen, spanischen, zur Kirchen- und Kulturgeschichte aus der diplomatischen Korrespondenz Jaymes II. (1291–1327)* (Berlin–Leipzig, 1908), 2: 741, no. 458.

²²⁰ Ed. C. Marinesco, "Notes sur les Catalans dans l'Empire byzantin pendant le règne de Jacques II (1291–1327)," in *Mélanges d'histoire du moyen âge offerts à Ferdinand Lot* (Paris, 1925), 508–9. The chrysobull grants privileges to traveling merchants and is not addressed to the community of resident merchants, as stated by Bensch, "Early Catalan Contacts," 142.

²²¹ Bensch, "Early Catalan Contacts," 150–54, yet for the resumption of trade, see Marinesco, "Notes sur les Catalans," 505–6.

²²² See *ibid.*, 506–7 and 512–13, new ed. of the chrysobull of 1320. For the following decades, see D. Duran i Duelt, *Manual del viatge fet per Berenguer Benet a Romania, 1341–1342. Estudi e edició* (Barcelona, 2002).

²²³ See E. Ashtor, *Levant Trade in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton, N.J., 1983), *passim*.

²²⁴ See M. Del Treppo, *I mercanti catalani e l'espansione della corona d'Aragona nel secolo XV* (Naples, 1972), 15–16, 55. Note that in 1352 the Catalan fleet returning from operations in the Bosphoros sailed from Constantinople to Negroponte, the southern Peloponnese, and Crete, thus bypassing Thessalonike on the way; see A. Luttrell, "John Cantacuzenus and the Catalans at Constantinople: 1352–1354," in Martínez Ferrando, *archivero: Miscelánea de estudios dedicados a su memoria. Asociación Nacional de Bibliotecarios, Archiveros, y Arqueólogos* (Barcelona, 1968), 271, repr. in Luttrell, *Latin Greece, the Hospitallers and the Crusades, 1291–1440* (London, 1982), no. IX.

²²⁵ On which see Philon, "Thessaloniki, Andalusia and the Golden Horde," 303–6, 312–14, and above, note 136.

agreed about a journey leading to Theologo (ancient Ephesos), capital of the Turkish emirate of Aydin, Thessalonike, and Constantinople.²²⁶ In 1381 a Barcelonese *cocha* anchoring in Chios was to sail to Thessalonike, return to Chios, and proceed from there via Theologo, Alexandria, and Beirut to Barcelona.²²⁷ In 1385 several Catalan merchants were arrested in Thessalonike, and their goods as well as the *cocha* on which they sailed were confiscated. The action was taken to compensate for the misdeeds of other Catalan merchants, accused of having evaded the obligations they had contracted in Pera toward Manuel II several years earlier. In 1386 King Peter IV of Aragon wrote two letters on behalf of his wronged subjects to the emperor, who ruled independently over Thessalonike from 1382 to 1387.²²⁸ In 1409 a Catalan vessel arrived in the city via Sicily, another from Tunis in 1412, while a third one stopped in 1414 in Naples, Sicily, and Chios before reaching Thessalonike.²²⁹ On 28 November of that year Emperor Manuel II sent a letter to King Ferdinand I of Aragon with a home-bound Catalan ship anchoring at Thessalonike, possibly the same vessel as the one just mentioned.²³⁰ In sum, the subjects of Aragon appear to have traded intermittently in Thessalonike, none of them settling there. Significantly, in the first half of the fifteenth century we witness the establishment of Catalan consuls in several ports of Romania, namely at Chios in 1404, at Modon in 1407, and at Candia in 1419, yet Thessalonike was not among them.²³¹

Ragusa was under Venetian rule from 1205 to 1358. In 1234 Manuel Doukas of Epiros awarded freedom of trade to Ragusa in his own territory. Yet the stringent restrictions which Venice imposed upon the city in 1232, confirmed in 1236 and 1252, directed Ragusa's trade toward the Balkans inland and practically ruled out any activity in Thessalonike at that stage.²³² Conditions changed in the fourteenth century. Ragusa's land trade through the Balkans and especially its maritime trade were intimately connected with Venetian commerce and largely evolved in the regions in which Venetian merchants were dominant. Ragusan merchants conducted intensive trade with Thessalonike either by land or by sea, reflected by the commercial deals they concluded with local Greeks and by the numerous couriers traveling between their own city and Thessalonike.²³³ A small num-

²²⁶ J. M. Madurell Marimón and A. García Sanz, eds., *Comandas comerciales barcelonesas de la baja edad media*, *Anejos del Anuario de estudios medievales* 4 (Barcelona, 1973), 2: 253–54, no. 124.

²²⁷ E. Basso, ed., *Notai genovesi in Oltremare. Atti rogati a Chio da Giuliano de Canella (2 novembre 1380–31 marzo 1381)*, *Accademia Ligure di Scienze e Lettere* 1 (Athens, 1993), 96–97, no. 41.

²²⁸ A. Luttrell, "La corona de Aragón y la Grecia catalana: 1379–1394," *Anuario de estudios medievales* 6 (1969): 225–26, repr. in idem, *Latin Greece*, no. XI. The dating of the arrest is based on one of the letters: Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari*, 634–35, no. DXXVIII. On Manuel's rule in Thessalonike, see Barker, *Manuel II*, 42–59.

²²⁹ See Del Treppo, *Mercanti catalani*, 613.

²³⁰ Ed. C. Marinesco, "Manuel II Paléologue et les rois d'Aragon. Commentaire sur quatre lettres inédites en latin, expédiées par la chancellerie byzantine," *Académie roumaine, Bulletin de la Section historique* 11 (1924): 200–201, no. II; see Barker, *Manuel II*, 333–34.

²³¹ See Del Treppo, *Mercanti catalani*, 56. However, there may have been earlier appointments of Catalan consuls in the region: see D. Durant i Duelt, "Monarquia, consellers i mercaders. Conflictivitat en el consolat català de Constantinoble a la primera meitat del segle XV," in M. T. Ferrer i Mallol and D. Coulon, *L'expansió catalana a la Mediterrània a la baixa edat mitjana*, *Anuario de estudios medievales*, Annex 36 (Barcelona, 1999), 35 and note 33.

²³² See Krekić, *Dubrovnik*, 26–29.

²³³ See A. E. Laiou, "In the Medieval Balkans: Economic Pressures and Conflicts in the Fourteenth Century," in S. Vryonis Jr., ed., *Byzantine Studies in Honor of Milton V. Anastos (Byzantina kai Metabyzantina* 4) (Malibu, Calif., 1985), 141, 143–46, repr. in Laiou, *Gender*, no. IX; Krekić, *Dubrovnik*, 67–70.

ber of Ragusans apparently resided in Thessalonike, among them Junius de Bona or Bunic, attested in the city in 1373 and 1377, who from there conducted business on a large scale, including with the mining center of Novo Brdo in Serbia.²³⁴ The Ragusans had no consul of their own in Thessalonike. While under Venice's rule they relied on Venetian officials when the need arose. In 1340 the Venetian ambassador to Constantinople, Giovanni Gradenigo, was instructed to obtain compensation for the goods robbed from a Ragusan merchant, a Venetian subject, who had died in Thessalonike.²³⁵ Surprisingly, though, the intervention of the Venetian consul in the city was also sought in 1371, although by then Ragusa was again independent. He was asked to obtain the release of a Ragusan merchant imprisoned by the Byzantine authorities.²³⁶

We know that some Armenians resided in villages close to Thessalonike in 1185.²³⁷ The Venetian-Byzantine treaty of 1277 reveals that the Armenians had a church of their own in the city, which was to be handed over to Venice.²³⁸ A small Armenian community must, nevertheless, have continued to exist in the following decades, since an Armenian bishop of Thessalonike attended in 1307 the church synod held at Sis in Cilician Armenia.²³⁹ Several monasteries on Mount Athos had *metochia* or subordinate monastic establishments of their own in Thessalonike. We do not know whether those of Iviron were in the hands of Greek or Georgian monks, or else members of both groups.²⁴⁰ The Serbian monastery of Hilandar also owned a *metochion*, attested from 1316 to 1351.²⁴¹ The Russian monks of St. Panteleimon on Mount Athos had one, devoted to St. Zenaïs. After a fire destroyed the archives of the Rossikon, Andronikos II confirmed their rights and possessions in 1311, yet without explicitly naming the *metochion*.²⁴² It is unclear whether these *metochia* reflect the presence of ethnic-cultural groups other than the monks, nor whether they acted as foci of collective identity around which individuals of similar origin tended to aggregate. It is likely that the toponym Σθλαβομέση, attested in 1117 only, apparently points to a Slav market at a much earlier period, yet we do not know whether it reflected a concentration of Slavs in Thessalonike.²⁴³

The first Turkish occupation of Thessalonike, which lasted from 1387 to 1403, witnessed the establishment of a new foreign group within the urban space, namely Turks.

²³⁴ Krekić, *Dubrovnik*, 153–54; 213–14, nos. 306, 307; 216, no. 321. See also Matschke, “Bergbauentwicklung,” 62–63.

²³⁵ Incomplete summaries by Thiriet, *Régestes*, 1: no. 98, and Krekić, *Dubrovnik*, 153 note 3.

²³⁶ Krekić, *Dubrovnik*, 153 and 211, no. 293.

²³⁷ Eustazio di Tessalonica, *Espugnazione*, 124.25–26.

²³⁸ MM 3: 89; TTh 3: 140.

²³⁹ Mansi 25: 140.

²⁴⁰ On these *metochia*, see J. Lefort, N. Oikonomidès, D. Papachryssanthou, and V. Kravari, eds., *Actes d'Iviron. III, De 1204 à 1328*, Archives de l'Athos 18 (Paris, 1994), 39–40; one of them is recorded as being in the hands of the Georgian monks: *ibid.*, 21–22.

²⁴¹ M. Živojinović, V. Kravari, and Ch. Giros, eds., *Actes de Chilandar. I, Des origines à 1319*, Archives de l'Athos 20 (Paris, 1998), 230, no. 33, lines 1–15, dated 1316, with reference to an earlier document; see also Introduction, 35, 48, 51. See also M. Živojinović, “Solinski metoč manastira Chilandara” (= “Le métoque de Chilandar à Thessalonique”), *ZRVI* 37 (1998): 111–19, in Serbo-Croatian with French summary.

²⁴² P. Lemerle, G. Dagron, and S. Ćirković, eds., *Actes de St. Pantéléemon*, Archives de l'Athos 12 (Paris, 1982), 95, no. 10, lines 37–38; further reference in 1353, yet without the name of the *metochion*: 100, no. 11, lines 28–29.

²⁴³ N. Oikonomidès, ed., *Actes de Docheiariou*, Archives de l'Athos 13 (Paris, 1984), 73–75, no. 4, lines 27 and 84, and commentary 79.

Their presence, which has been overlooked until now, was not limited to administrative personnel and a military garrison. These were presumably stationed in the city's acropolis where, according to Archbishop Symeon, the church of the Savior was converted into a mosque.²⁴⁴ The Turkish population also included immigrants not fulfilling any official functions, a feature common to many conquered cities. Indeed, such Turks settled in Thessalonike, as we learn from somewhat later sources that will soon be adduced. They were apparently not numerous, and most of them must have established themselves in the vicinity of the monastery of St. John the Baptist, the only ecclesiastical institution outside the acropolis taken over for Muslim religious services. The monastery was apparently located in the city's center somewhat south of the Roman agora.²⁴⁵ The assertion of Archbishop Symeon that many churches and monasteries in the city had been desecrated during the first Turkish occupation is not confirmed by other sources and appears to be an intentional overstatement.²⁴⁶

One would assume that the Turkish residents were compelled to leave Thessalonike when Bayazid's son Suleyman transferred the city to Byzantine rule in the spring of 1403. To be sure, the treaty concluded shortly before 20 February of that year at Gallipoli between the Turkish prince and several Christian powers, including Emperor John VII on behalf of Byzantium, provided for the handover of Thessalonike, Kalamaria, Chalkidike, and the littoral of the Thermaic Gulf to the empire and for the evacuation of all Turks settled in these territories.²⁴⁷ However, it also stipulated that Turks who had legally bought property would retain the assets they owned.²⁴⁸ In other words, it was envisaged that some Turks would remain under Byzantine rule. This disposition has been interpreted as referring to the rural areas recovered by the empire.²⁴⁹ In fact, it dealt with all the territories, including Thessalonike.

The presence of Turkish residents in the city after 1403 is indeed confirmed, both directly and indirectly. According to a testimony recorded in Genoa, a female slave purchased by the Genoese Filippo Galea da Finale, established in Thessalonike, had fled and returned to her former Turkish master and was seen several times in the streets of the city in 1410.²⁵⁰ It follows that the Turk too resided there. This individual case was not isolated, as revealed by some Venetian sources dealing with agreements between Byzantine rulers and the Ottomans. Manuel II either ratified the treaty concluded at Gallipoli between

²⁴⁴ Since no church of that name is known in the acropolis, Balfour, *Works of Symeon*, 251–53, suggests that Symeon meant the upper city. This interpretation may be safely rejected. It is excluded that Symeon, who was obviously familiar with the city's topography, would have used "acropolis" for another section of the city.

²⁴⁵ On the monastery of St. John the Baptist, see Balfour, *Works of Symeon*, 253. Suggested siting in M. L. Rautman, "Ignatius of Smolensk and the Late Byzantine Monasteries of Thessaloniki," *REB* 49 (1991): 159–60 and note 91.

²⁴⁶ As rightly argued by Balfour, *Works of Symeon*, 251, 253.

²⁴⁷ The treaty survives in an Italian version, cited in *DVL* 2: 290–93, no. 159, and by Dennis, "Byzantine-Turkish Treaty," 77–80; see also *ibid.*, 81 note 1, for the identification of the regions. Dating of the treaty by Barker, *Manuel II*, 224–25 and note 43, and on the handover of the city, *ibid.*, 454. However, the occupation of the acropolis took place somewhat later, on 17 June 1403: see Balfour, *Works of Symeon*, 116.

²⁴⁸ Relevant passage expressing Suleyman's obligations in *DVL* 2: 291, and Dennis, "Byzantine-Turkish Treaty," 78 §3, reads as follows: *et in quele contrade tuti quelli Turchi che habia possession, io li die cazar via de la; et in questi luogi tuti quelli, si Griesi como Turchi, che habia comprado alguna cossa per la soa moneda, che li sia soy.*

²⁴⁹ See N. Oikonomides, "Ottoman Influence on Late Byzantine Fiscal Practice," *SüdostF* 45 (1989): 3–4.

²⁵⁰ See above, p. 116.

John VII and Suleyman or possibly concluded another one with the prince later in 1403, on almost identical terms.²⁵¹

It would seem, though, that there was an additional agreement specifically regarding Thessalonike, which has been overlooked until now. This is implied by a Venetian document of 1425, which refers to an understanding reached between the Byzantine despot in charge of the city and the Ottomans regarding jurisdiction over the Turks staying there.²⁵² It is likely that this agreement was concluded by John VII shortly after he became despot of Thessalonike in the autumn of 1403, rather than by him at a later period or by his successor, Manuel's third son Andronikos, who ruled over the city from 1408 to 1423.²⁵³ The agreement stipulated that the Ottomans were entitled to maintain a resident *kadi* in Thessalonike, who would be the sole judge in cases involving Turks among themselves. These clearly included traders on business, peasants established in the rural hinterland of Thessalonike who came to sell their products, and settlers who had been allowed to remain in the city.²⁵⁴ The agreement in this respect conformed with the one concluded in 1391 between Emperor Manuel II and Bayazid for Constantinople, which in addition determined the granting of a quarter for Turkish merchants in the empire's capital.²⁵⁵ However, the willingness of John VII to accept the presence of a resident *kadi* in Thessalonike, expressed in all likelihood in the autumn of 1403, was in stark contrast to Manuel's expulsion of the Turks from Constantinople around that time.²⁵⁶ It suggests that as despot of Thessalonike John VII conducted a somewhat independent policy in matters regarding the city over which he ruled.

The agreement of 1403 concerning the *kadi* was still in force when Venice occupied Thessalonike in 1423. Around two years later the Venetian Senate instructed Fantin Michiel, captain-general of the sea, to conduct negotiations with Murad II. He was to demand that the sultan recognize the Venetian possession of Thessalonike and its dependencies on the same terms he had formerly agreed to with respect to the despot's rule over the city. However, he was to obtain important restrictions regarding the judicial authority of the *kadi* over the Turks. It would be limited to financial disputes, the Turks would be al-

²⁵¹ See Dennis, "Byzantine-Turkish Treaty," 76–77.

²⁵² Summary in N. Iorga, "Notes et extraits pour servir à l'histoire des croisades au XV^e siècle," *ROL* 5 (1897), 192–96, esp. 194 (= Iorga, *Notes* (as above, n. 183), 1: 391–95, esp. 393).

²⁵³ On the dating of John's arrival in the city, see Barker, *Manuel II*, 243–45, and on the beginning of Andronikos' rule, *ibid.*, 278–79. In any event, the agreement must have been reached before 1409, when Suleyman's political position and ability to bargain were weakened, on which see *ibid.*, 252.

²⁵⁴ On Turks settled in the rural hinterland of Thessalonike, see above, p. 104.

²⁵⁵ See Barker, *Manuel II*, 85 and 85–86 note 2. N. Necipoğlu, "Ottoman Merchants in Constantinople during the First Half of the Fifteenth Century," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 16 (1992): 158–59. Contrary to Barker's interpretation, however, the evidence assembled in that note definitely points to a resident *kadi*. The entry of 16 October 1391 in the Genoese expense account for Pera is convincing in that respect: Iorga, ed., "Registres de comptes de la colonie génoise de Péra," in "Notes et extraits," *ROL* 4 (1896): 71 (= Iorga, *Notes*, 1: 52). It refers to the [*kadi*] *qui moram facit in Constantinopoli*. In medieval Latin, *moram facere* means "residing," and not "making a delay," as translated by Barker; significantly, the verb *facere* appears in the present tense. Moreover, the renewed demand of Bayazid in 1399 regarding the *kadi* in Constantinople does not imply that the agreement had not been implemented, as argued by Barker, followed by S. Reinert, "The Muslim Presence in Constantinople, 9th–15th Centuries: Some Preliminary Observations," in Ahrweiler and Laiou, *Studies* (as above, note 1) 144–47, who suggests that the *kadi* was not installed in Constantinople until 1399. Bayazid's demand was necessary because he wished to ensure that John VII, a new ruler, would abide by the sultan's earlier agreement with Manuel II.

²⁵⁶ On which see Barker, *Manuel II*, 250. Manuel II had arrived in the capital in June 1403: *ibid.*, 237.

lowed to turn to a Venetian court even in such matters, and criminal cases involving them would be tried exclusively by the Venetian authorities of Thessalonike.²⁵⁷ It follows that the *kadi* posted there exercised jurisdiction in criminal matters, although as a rule this was not the case in Islamic countries.²⁵⁸ Murad II at first accepted the Venetian proposal in November 1426, yet later refused to ratify the agreement he had reached with Venice.²⁵⁹ As a result the *kadi* must have retained his extensive judicial prerogatives. These, however, did not extend over all the Turks present in Thessalonike. From 1423 to 1426 the Turkish pretender Mustafa, who claimed to be the son of Sultan Bayazid I, was stationed with his men in the city. These Turks did obviously not consider themselves subjects of the sultan, nor would they have submitted to the *kadi*'s jurisdiction.²⁶⁰

One may wonder until when Turks continued to reside in Thessalonike under Venetian rule. A contract drafted in the city on 10 May 1432 may offer some indication in this respect. The local monastery of Nea Mone had previously leased a workshop with a press for the extraction of linseed oil, situated in the quarter of St. Menas, to a Turk whose name is not mentioned. The contract stipulated the transfer of the facility from the Turk to Constantine Manglavites.²⁶¹ It is likely that this individual was one of the Greeks resettled in Thessalonike by Murad II. Shortly after the conquest, the sultan had ordered all the former residents who had left before the siege to return to the city and had issued a similar decree with respect to those who had been ransomed from Turkish captivity. Turkish administrators and soldiers were evidently stationed in Thessalonike, yet, according to the extant sources, no other Turks were resettled there in the period immediately following the conquest. It is only two or three years later, after returning to Thessalonike, that Murad II decided to transfer to the city about one thousand Turks from Yenitse, a measure promptly carried out, either in 1432 or 1433.²⁶²

The Turk who had leased the oil press before May 1432 deserves particular attention in our context. We may assume that he was not one of the Ottoman officials or men of arms established in the city soon after the conquest of 1430. Indeed, it is unlikely that the monastery of Nea Mone would have canceled or failed to renew a contract with a Turk belonging either to the sultan's administration or armed forces, for fear of reprisals by that individual or the Ottoman authorities.²⁶³ On the other hand, it is clear that the Turkish operator of the press was already established in Thessalonike before the forceful resettlement of the Turks ordered by Murad II. It would seem, therefore, that he also resided there dur-

²⁵⁷ Iorga, "Notes et extraits," *ROL* 5 (1897): 317–18 (= Iorga, *Notes*, 1: 417–18): *possit tenere unum [cadi] suum in civitate Salonichi, pro jus reddendo Teucris pro differentiis solummodo que forent inter ipsos, pro pecuniis solummodo, et non in nulla alia re*; same clause in Venetian dialect: Sathas, *Documents*, 1: 184.14–20, no. 117. The earlier agreement concluded between the Ottomans and the despot is also mentioned with respect to the return of fugitive slaves to the territory from which they had escaped: *ibid.*, 184.21–24.

²⁵⁸ See E. Tyan, *Histoire de l'organisation judiciaire en pays d'Islam*, 2d ed. (Leiden, 1960), 342–429, 600–603. This important study, however, does not deal with the Ottoman judicial system, nor have I found any other study on that subject relevant for the early Ottoman period. In Thessalonike the absence of Ottoman officers exercising criminal justice explains the intrusion of the *kadi* in that sphere.

²⁵⁹ See Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant*, 2: 26–27.

²⁶⁰ Barker, *Manuel II*, 374; Balfour, *Works of Symeon*, 182–83.

²⁶¹ P. Lemerle, A. Guillou, N. Svoronos, and D. Papachryssanthou, eds., *Actes de Lavra. III, De 1329 à 1500*, Archives de l'Athos 10 (Paris, 1979), 183–85, no. 168, lines 4–7: *παρὰ Τούρκου τινοῦς*.

²⁶² See Vryonis, "The Ottoman Conquest," 300–304, 311–12. The absence of new Turkish settlers soon after the conquest may also be inferred from the fact that only two churches were turned into mosques at that time.

²⁶³ These Turks would not have operated the facility by themselves, yet would have subleased it to a Greek.

ing the last siege of the city and at the time of the conquest.²⁶⁴ At first glance this appears to be excluded, yet one should take into account that Venice constantly sought to appease the Ottomans, despite the heavy pressure they exerted upon Thessalonike and the occasional blockade of the city between 1423 and 1430. The expulsion of Turkish settlers would have clearly antagonized the Ottomans. It follows that some Turks resided in Thessalonike throughout the entire Venetian period and remained there after the Ottoman conquest, and that the leaseholder of the oil press was one of them. That conquest opened the city to Turkish settlement on a much larger scale than before, whether as a result of the demographic policy implemented by the Ottoman rulers or spontaneous immigration. A population census carried out in Thessalonike in 1478 lists 862 Turkish and 1,275 Greek households.²⁶⁵

The Jews were the oldest minority group in the city, and the only one whose continuous presence since antiquity may be taken for granted. The evidence concerning them is more abundant than for any other "internal" minority group, thanks to the conjunction of Jewish and Byzantine sources, the latter including writings reflecting Byzantine attitudes toward the Jews, in addition to Venetian documents dealing with taxation. The Jews were clearly set apart by creed, religious and legal limitations, some degree of internal jurisdiction regarding civil matters among themselves, recognized by the state, as well as by special taxation, in any event in Thessalonike, as we shall see below. To these one should add cultural traits such as particular customs, a calendar of their own, and, finally, the use of Hebrew as an expression of collective self-identity and a medium of communication with Jews residing beyond the boundaries of the empire.²⁶⁶

The Jewish traveler Benjamin of Tudela, who visited Thessalonike in the early 1160s, estimated at five hundred the number of Jews living in the city, among them silk workers. This community, one of the largest he encountered in the empire, was headed by an official appointed by the imperial authorities. Benjamin's report implies that the latter imposed residential segregation upon the Jews.²⁶⁷ His testimony in this respect is confirmed by Archbishop Eustathios of Thessalonike, who between 1185 and 1191 complained that during the time of his immediate predecessors the Jews had been permitted to spread throughout the city and that some of them resided in Christian houses decorated in the past with holy images. He did not know whether this process had occurred as a result of oversight, with the tacit agreement of the authorities, or in the wake of an imperial decree allowing for the relaxation of residential restrictions.²⁶⁸ Whatever the case, the development attested by Eustathios may be ascribed to the two decades or so following Benjamin

²⁶⁴ Incidentally, during the last siege of Thessalonike some inhabitants driven by famine mixed "bran made from crushed linseed . . . with a little barley or sometimes wheat flour": trans. Balfour, *Works of Symeon*, 174–75. This supposes the existence of a number of such oil presses in the city.

²⁶⁵ See H. W. Lowry, "Portrait of a City: The Population and Topography of Ottoman Selânik (Thessaloniki) in the Year 1478," *Δίπτυχα* 2 (1980–81): 277–82. On the period between 1430 and 1478, see Vryonis, "The Ottoman Conquest," 313–21.

²⁶⁶ See Jacoby, "Les Juifs de Byzance," 103–54; Laiou, "Mechanisms," 168–71, 179, yet about taxation see below; N. de Lange, "Hebrews, Greeks or Romans? Jewish Culture and Identity in Byzantium," in Smythe, *Strangers to Themselves* (as above, note 1), 106–18.

²⁶⁷ Adler, *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, 13, and trans., 11. See D. Jacoby, "Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine," *Byzantion* 37 (1967): 182–83, repr. in idem, *Société et démographie à Byzance et en Romanie latine* (London, 1975), no. II.

²⁶⁸ G. L. F. Tafel, ed., *Eustathii metropolitae Thessalonicensis opuscula* (Frankfurt am Main, 1832), 340.44–47, letter 32, to the patriarch of Constantinople. It is clear that the Jews living in former Christian houses had con-

of Tudela's visit in Thessalonike. It is unclear whether residential segregation was reimposed as a result of the archbishop's intervention or at some later time before the Latin conquest of 1204. Incidentally, Eustathios also mentions the presence of Jews in two villages close to Thessalonike at the time of the Norman siege of the city in 1185.²⁶⁹

The continuity of the Jewish community of Thessalonike in the early thirteenth century is illustrated shortly after the Latin occupation of the city in 1204. As noted earlier, Benedict Cardinal of Santa Susanna, sent by Innocent III as papal legate to conduct talks with the Greek Church, passed through Thessalonike in 1205 on his way to Constantinople, in 1207 on his return journey to Rome, or possibly even on both occasions. He was accompanied by Nicholas of Otranto, who served as his interpreter. Nicholas reports in his "Discourse against the Jews," completed some fifteen years later, that he conducted religious disputations with the Jews of Thebes, Thessalonike, and Constantinople, the three most important Jewish communities of Romania at that time.²⁷⁰ According to a Jewish author writing ca. 1270, Theodore Doukas of Epiros initiated in 1229 some violent action against the Jews of his territories, apparently confiscating their wealth to finance his military operations. The same source reports that Emperor John III Vatatzes, who captured Thessalonike in 1246, ordered the forceful conversion of the Jews in 1253 or 1254.²⁷¹ For lack of evidence we cannot ascertain to what extent these events affected the Jews of Thessalonike. It is noteworthy that in Constantinople Emperor Michael VIII reverted to the traditional Byzantine policy applied before 1204 regarding the residential segregation of the Jews, and that the Jewish quarter of Vlanga attested in his reign maintained its existence until the Ottoman conquest of 1453.²⁷² One may assume, therefore, that the same policy was implemented in Thessalonike from the early Palaiologan period onward, although the existence of a Jewish quarter is attested only much later.

We have already noted the letter which Demetrios Kydones sent in 1368 to the patriarch of Constantinople, Philotheos Kokkinos, in which he referred to the latter's Jewish origin.²⁷³ The letter provides indirect evidence regarding the existence of the Jewish community in Thessalonike at the time of the patriarch's birth around 1300. In 1329 the Jewish scribe Adoniyah, son of Abba Kalomiti, completed in Thessalonike the copy of a Hebrew commentary on the *Guide to the Perplexed* by Maimonides.²⁷⁴ His work implies the presence of a wealthy patron, member of a group of Jewish intellectuals in the city. The Greek surname of the scribe points to the latter's Romaniote origin. He must have belonged to the Kalomiti family attested in Negroponte between 1279 and 1351, and was apparently the son of a leader of that city's Jewish community.²⁷⁵ The intensive trade relations

sealed the Christian images. On the dating of Eustathios' writings, see P. Magdalino, "Eustathios and Thessalonika," in C. N. Constantinides et al., eds., *ΦΙΛΑΕΛΛΗΝ. Studies in Honour of Robert Browning*, Istituto ellenico di Studi bizantini e neoellenici di Venezia, *Bibliothèque* 17 (Venice, 1996), 226–29.

²⁶⁹ Eustazio di Tessalonica, *Espugnazione*, 124.25–26.

²⁷⁰ See Jacoby, "The Jewish Community of Constantinople," 37–38.

²⁷¹ See Bowman, *Jews of Byzantium*, 13–18, on the nature and dating of these persecutions; the Jewish source is translated *ibid.*, 228–31, no. 24. There is no corresponding Byzantine evidence.

²⁷² See Jacoby, "Quartiers juifs," 189–96, 216–18, and *idem*, "The Jewish Community of Constantinople," 38–40.

²⁷³ See above, p. 87.

²⁷⁴ See Bowman, *Jews of Byzantium*, 67, and trans. *ibid.*, 252, no. 47.

²⁷⁵ Significantly, Adoniyah Kalomiti refers to his father Abba as "naguid and head" [of the community]. The latter's prominent position is attested for the years 1329–31, thus precisely at the time in which the scribe

between Negroponte and Thessalonike, mentioned earlier, may have been conducive to his migration, which provides a further illustration of the fairly well attested currents of Jewish mobility within Romania in the fourteenth century.²⁷⁶

Somewhat later evidence on Jewish presence in Thessalonike is provided by a verdict of the patriarchal court of Constantinople, issued between July 1337 and February 1338.²⁷⁷ The verdict deals with the accusations of a local Greek by the name of Chionios against some members of the city's Orthodox clergy. Chionios had apparently served in the judicial branch of the imperial administration before embracing Judaism. This would account for the fact that after his conversion some Jews voluntarily submitted to his arbitration in civil litigation between themselves, the precise nature of which is not specified, in order to avoid the jurisdiction of the rabbinical court of their own community.²⁷⁸ At one point Chionios denounced to the ecclesiastical authorities local Greeks who had attacked the Jews and insulted their creed, which implies that he held the clergy responsible for incitement. The inquest regarding Chionios' accusations had at first been postponed because the seat of the city's archbishop was vacant. Since Gregory Koutales is attested in that function in December 1334 and Ignatios Glabas succeeded him from 1336 to 1341, the proceedings must have begun in 1335 rather than in 1336 and the events reported in the verdict must have occurred within these years or somewhat earlier.²⁷⁹ In any event, the verdict illustrates the existence of a well-organized Jewish community in Thessalonike with its own judicial court around 1335, its religious influence in some Christian circles, as well as the antagonism its presence raised in the ranks of the local clergy and laity.²⁸⁰

worked in Thessalonike. On the family, see D. Jacoby, "Venice and the Venetian Jews in the Eastern Mediterranean," in G. Cozzi, ed., *Gli Ebrei e Venezia (secoli XIV–XVIII)* (Milan, 1987), 43 and 54–55, notes 51–52, repr. in Jacoby, *Studies*, no. X; S. Borsari, "Ricchi e poveri nelle comunità ebraiche di Candia e Negroponte," in Maltezou, *Πλούσιοι*, 221–22. However, Borsari, *ibid.*, 218–19, 221, confuses the Kalomiti with another Jewish family residing at Negroponte; for the distinction between the two, see my study cited above in this note.

²⁷⁶ See D. Jacoby, "Quelques aspects de la vie juive en Crète dans la première moitié du XVe siècle," *Actes du Troisième Congrès international d'études crétoises (Rethymnon, 1971)*, vol. 2 (Athens, 1974), 108–12, repr. in *idem, Recherches sur la Méditerranée orientale*, no. X; Jacoby, "Quartiers juifs," 213–14.

²⁷⁷ H. Hunger, O. Kresten, E. Kislinger, and C. Cupane, eds. and trans., *Das Register des Patriarchats von Konstantinopel, 2. Teil: Edition und Übersetzung der Urkunden aus den Jahren 1337–1350*, CFHB 19.2 (Vienna, 1995), 104–17, no. 111, with German translation. The English one by Bowman, *Jews of Byzantium*, 268–69, no. 58, is marred by serious mistakes, which have led him to unwarranted interpretations *ibid.*, 68–69. I have added here some new perspectives to the analysis of the verdict by F. Dölger, "Zur Frage des jüdischen Anteils an der Bevölkerung Thessalonikes im XIV. Jahrhundert," in *The Joshua Starr Memorial Volume* (New York, 1953), 129–33, repr. in *idem, PARASPORA. 30 Aufsätze zur Geschichte, Kultur und Sprache des byzantinischen Reiches* (Ettal, 1961), 378–83.

²⁷⁸ This procedure was recognized by Justinianic and later Byzantine law: see Laiou, "Mechanisms," 168–69, 171.

²⁷⁹ On Ignatios Glabas and his term of office, see *PLP* 4222. His predecessor, Gregory Koutales, is attested as archbishop in 1334. *PLP* 13616 suggests that he served in that capacity between 1334 and 1336, obviously on the assumption that he was succeeded almost immediately by Glabas. However, the year 1336 for his death is highly doubtful, in view of the vacancy mentioned in the verdict concerning Chionios, on which see above. The chronology of Koutales' term should thus be corrected.

²⁸⁰ Several authors of the 19th and 20th centuries, too numerous to be cited here, speak of the arrival in Thessalonike of Jews from Hungary after their supposed expulsion from that country in 1360 or 1376 and ascribe to 1376 the founding of the first Ashkenazi synagogue following western Jewish rite in the city. However, none of them refers to primary sources. N. Berend, *At the Gate of Christendom. Jews, Muslims and "Pagans" in Medieval Hungary, c. 1100–c. 1300* (Cambridge, 2001), 325, mentions a brief expulsion in the 1350s, yet in a personal communication stresses that the contention that Jews were expelled from Hungary in these years rests

The first Turkish occupation of Thessalonike, which lasted from 1387 to 1403, did not disrupt the continuity of the local Jewish community. Patriarch Matthew I of Constantinople refers in 1401, in a letter sent to the archbishop of Thessalonike, to the ἁλλότριτοι who, in addition to the Christians, disapprove of the behavior of the hieromonk Nathanael. In this specific context, the term ἁλλότριτοι appears to stand for Jews.²⁸¹ In the summer of 1403, thus around the time Thessalonike reverted to Byzantine rule, a Jew from Toledo calling himself “the Spaniard” finished the copy of a manuscript for his personal use. He may have remained in Thessalonike for a short time only, since he had previously worked in Negroponte in 1401 and was in Modon in the winter of 1404.²⁸² His appearance in Thessalonike nevertheless implies the presence of other Jews in the city, from whom he had borrowed his model. It also raises the possibility that some Jews who had left Catalonia after the persecutions of 1391 had settled in the city. Such immigrants are attested in the following years in Crete and somewhat later in Constantinople.²⁸³

A document of 1420 preserved in the Athonite monastery of Dionysiou offers indirect yet precious evidence regarding the location and nature of Jewish residence in Thessalonike. It mentions within a specific topographic context the “ancient (or former) Jewish neighborhood gutted by fire,” situated northeast of the church of the Forty Martyrs. This church was located to the north and close to the *leophoros* and about the middle of the latter’s east-west course through the city, which approximately corresponded to the present Egnatia Street.²⁸⁴ A fourth- or fifth-century inscription from a Samaritan synagogue has been found to the west of the Panagia ton Chalkeon church, more or less in the area described by our document. It has been suggested, therefore, that there may have been topographical continuity in Jewish residence from the early Byzantine period to sometime before 1420.²⁸⁵ This is highly doubtful for two main reasons. First, it is not at all certain that the Samaritans resided in the fourth or fifth century in the same urban region as the Jews. In addition, one should note that the Panagia ton Chalkeon church was built in the eleventh century in a vacant area.²⁸⁶ This implies either the absence of structures in the previous period or the disappearance of earlier buildings and therefore precludes Jewish residential continuity in that urban section. In any event, a more precise location than the one suggested above cannot be established, since the siting of the Omphalos quarter mentioned in relation to the Jewish neighborhood has not been convincingly established.²⁸⁷

Neither the date nor the circumstances of the fire mentioned in 1420 are known. The

on very shaky ground and has been undermined by recent archaeological excavations. In any event, there is no evidence that Hungarian Jews arrived in Thessalonike.

²⁸¹ MM 2: 515.30, and see also 521.15. For the interpretation of the term in that context, see Dölger, “Zur Frage,” 133 and note 14.

²⁸² The colophon mentions Tammuz, the tenth month of the Jewish calendar which falls in July and August, and the Jewish year 5163; trans. and note on the scribe in Bowman, *Jews of Byzantium*, 296, no. 108. On the date at which Thessalonike reverted to Byzantine rule, see above, p. 120.

²⁸³ See Jacoby, “Quelques aspects,” 111; idem, “Quartiers juifs,” 213–14.

²⁸⁴ N. Oikonomidès, ed., *Actes de Dionysiou*, Archives de l’Athos 4 (Paris, 1968), 112, no. 19, lines 8–11: τῆς παλαιᾶς πυρκαϊστοῦ Ἑβραϊδος; proposed location *ibid.*, 111–12.

²⁸⁵ J. M. Spieser, “Les inscriptions de Thessalonique,” *TM* 5 (1973): 149–50, no. 1.

²⁸⁶ Spieser, *Thessalonique et ses monuments*, 86.

²⁸⁷ Despite the attempt by Oikonomidès, *Actes de Docheiariou*, 80. See his conjectural reconstruction of the topography of Palaiologan Thessalonike, *ibid.*, 79, fig. 4, yet in view of the clues provided by the document cited above, note 284, his siting of Omphalos is clearly erroneous.

reference to the gutted neighborhood implies that the latter had not been rebuilt and that the Jews had established themselves elsewhere, whether in a vacant urban space or in a thinly populated area. It has already been suggested above that the imperial policy of Jewish residential segregation in Thessalonike was renewed in the early Palaiologan period.²⁸⁸ The term *Ἐβραῖς* used in 1420 appears to confirm that policy, since it implies a concentrated Jewish residence. We may assume, therefore, that after the fire the Byzantine authorities, rather than the Jews themselves, determined the site of the new Jewish neighborhood. The concentration of the Jews in the same urban area seems to imply that all of them were imperial subjects and that there were no Venetian Jews in Thessalonike in the years immediately preceding 1423, contrary to the latter's presence in Constantinople. Indeed, in the capital most Venetian Jews resided in a section of the Venetian quarter.²⁸⁹

The location of the new Jewish neighborhood created in Thessalonike sometime before 1420 is unknown. Ottoman evidence from the sixteenth century onward is irrelevant in this respect.²⁹⁰ Nor is the location of the Jewish house to the north of the *leophoros* and close to the *Incantadas*, recorded in the nineteenth century, of any relevance for the Byzantine period.²⁹¹ Indeed, the entire Jewish population of Thessalonike was deported to Constantinople-Istanbul by the Turkish authorities around 1455, and no Jews were to be found in Thessalonike in the following decades, as illustrated by Ottoman population censuses carried out from 1478 to 1490.²⁹² The Sephardic and Ashkenazi Jews settling in the city from ca. 1490 onward established themselves to the south of the *leophoros*.²⁹³ There is no way to ascertain whether or not the area they chose corresponded to the site of the neighborhood attested in 1420. Whatever the case, it is clear that the continuity of Jewish presence in Thessalonike until ca. 1455 was not synonymous with the topographical continuity of the city's Jewish neighborhood.²⁹⁴ Nor does the continuous presence of the Jews in Thessalonike until ca. 1455 entail that they maintained their participation in the local manufacture of silk textiles, in which they had been involved in the twelfth century.²⁹⁵ Un-

²⁸⁸ See above, p. 124.

²⁸⁹ On the Venetian Jews and their neighborhood in the capital, see Jacoby, "Quartiers juifs," 205–14, and idem, "Vénitiens naturalisés," 220, 224, 227–28, 230–31.

²⁹⁰ Spieser, *Thessalonique et ses monuments*, 87, seems nevertheless to rely on it.

²⁹¹ On this house, see *ibid.*, 86–87.

²⁹² On deportation shortly after 1453, see Lowry, "Portrait of a City," 261–64; dating to ca. 1455 by J. Hacker, "The Sürgün System and Jewish Society in the Ottoman Empire during the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries," in A. Rodrigue, ed., *Ottoman and Turkish Jewry*, University Turkish Studies 12 (Bloomington, Ind., 1992), 9–10. To the census of 1478, used by Lowry, one should add those of 1488–90 as well as Jewish sources, all examined by J. Hacker, "The Jewish Community in Saloniki and Its Components in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: A Chapter in the History of the Jewish Community in the Ottoman Empire and Its Relations with the Authorities" (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1978), 93–98, 168 (in Hebrew). The community of Thessalonian Jews in Istanbul is registered in a population census carried out in 1540: see Lowry, "Portrait of a City," 262. However, it split later at an unknown date into two communities, registered as "Great Selânik" and "Little Selânik": see U. Heyd, "The Jewish Communities of Istanbul in the Seventeenth Century," *Oriens* 6 (1953): 300, 304, 306, 311.

²⁹³ On the influx of Jews to Thessalonike since the late 15th century and the location of their quarter, see Lowry, "Portrait of a City," 261, 269, 277. Hacker, "The Jewish Community in Saloniki," 97–98, 169, 223–25, provides evidence from Jewish sources and data from Ottoman censuses carried out in the first half of the 16th century. Since there was no compulsory residential concentration of Jews in the Ottoman period, some of them established themselves to the north of the *leophoros*.

²⁹⁴ Such was also the case in Constantinople: see Jacoby, "Quartiers juifs," 167–227.

²⁹⁵ On which see above, p. 123.

fortunately, there is not a single shred of evidence regarding their economic pursuits between 1204 and ca. 1455.

In the Byzantine period the Jews of Thessalonike had paid an annual sum of 1,000 hyperpera to the imperial treasury. This is implied by a petition they submitted to Venice in 1425, two years after the latter's takeover of their city.²⁹⁶ We do not know when this collective tax had been imposed, yet it is likely that it had been levied for a long time. It obviously did not exempt the Jews from taxes paid by other Byzantine subjects on an individual basis, for instance in commercial transactions. No other urban minority group in the empire is known to have paid a yearly collective tax to the imperial treasury in the Palaiologan period.²⁹⁷ The Thessalonian Jews were thus subjected to a special fiscal regime, which was clearly discriminatory.²⁹⁸ We may safely assume that the Jews bore a disproportionate fiscal burden, compared with the city's other inhabitants. The sum they paid, therefore, does not offer any indication regarding their numbers, nor regarding their role in the city's economy.²⁹⁹ Indeed, the amount of the collective tax reported in 1425 had remained constant for many years, regardless of demographic fluctuations within the Jewish community and the state of wealth of its individual members. It is hardly plausible, though, that the Jews were numerous at the onset of Venetian rule in 1423.³⁰⁰

After taking hold of Thessalonike, Venice maintained at first the amount of the tax imposed upon the local Jewish community in the Byzantine period. It is likely that the worsening economic conditions prevailing in the city caused by Turkish pressure, which continued in the following years, as well as the heavy tax induced the most prosperous members of the community to emigrate.³⁰¹ As a result there was an increase in the fiscal burden resting on the remaining Jews, already affected by the economic contraction. In 1425 their representatives requested a reduction of the collective tax they had paid in the past when they were numerous. They argued that the authorities should take into account the fiscal capacity of the community's individual members, who were now few in numbers and poor. The Venetian government agreed to lower the yearly sum to 800 hyperpera should the city gates be closed or, in other words, should the city be cut off from its hinterland for a lengthy period.³⁰² The economic conditions in Thessalonike wors-

²⁹⁶ See below, p. 128 and note 302.

²⁹⁷ On the other hand, some ethnic groups settled in rural areas of the Peloponnese and Thrace paid collective taxes, yet their nature and purpose were quite different: see Laiou, "Mechanisms," 180.

²⁹⁸ Contrary to Laiou, "Mechanisms," 179. Note also the collective fine imposed upon the Jews of Constantinople in the 1090s: see Jacoby, "The Jewish Community of Constantinople," 32–35. The nature of the payment imposed upon the Jews of Zichna in the Palaiologan period is unclear. I shall not deal here with Jewish taxation in Byzantium in general, a vexing issue about which much has been written without achieving a consensus. For a summary of views other than mine, see Bowman, *Jews of Byzantium*, 41–48, and Laiou, at the beginning of this note.

²⁹⁹ Contrary to Harvey, "Economic Conditions," 122, who argues that they were "a significant factor."

³⁰⁰ As claimed, for instance, by Vryonis, "The Ottoman Conquest," 308.

³⁰¹ The right of Thessalonians to leave their city and settle elsewhere was expressly mentioned in the agreement which the despot Andronikos concluded on their behalf with Venice in 1423: Sathas, *Documents*, 1: 135.33–34, 136.1–3, 138.2–4, no. 86. An official of the archbishopric was among those who left between the Venetian takeover of 1423 and 1425: S. Kugéas, ed., "Notizbuch eines Beamten der Metropolis in Thessalonike aus dem Anfang des XV. Jahrhunderts," *BZ* 23 (1914): 152, no. 82.

³⁰² ASV, Senato, Misti, reg. 55, fol. 142r, §19. Partial transcription of the clause with some errors in Mertzios, *Μνημεία*, 59, note 1, and inaccurate English translation in Bowman, *Jews of Byzantium*, 306, no. 122.

ened after 1425, and Jewish emigration apparently continued in the following four years. Interestingly, a Jew with the toponymic surname Salonicho appears in 1428 as a resident of Candia,³⁰³ yet it is impossible to determine whether he had left Thessalonike for Crete in those years or earlier, or still whether he had inherited his surname from his forefathers.

In 1429 the Jews complained about the extortion of exorbitant fees for the opening of the city gates whenever a Jewish funeral procession headed for their cemetery. In response to that grievance the Venetian Senate ordered that no more than the customary fee should be charged.³⁰⁴ The main Jewish request, however, dealt once more with a reduction of the collective tax. The Jews claimed that the latter, already curtailed to 800 hyperpera, should be entirely abolished until the return of peace with the Turks. The rejection of this proposal by Venice is not surprising, in view of the heavy burden resting on its finances in Thessalonike. Indeed, in addition to current expenses for the city's defense, the treaty it signed in 1427 with the admiral of Gallipoli, Sarudja bey, who represented Sultan Murad II, stipulated an annual payment of around 4,000 ducats to the Turks from the revenue collected in the city. Venice also granted some 500 ducats and about 250 more in the following years to each of two Turkish vizirs.³⁰⁵ The Commune adopted the alternative proposal of the Thessalonian Jews, already submitted in 1425, namely that the amount of their collective tax would be determined by their numbers and their individual financial condition. However, the Ottomans occupied Thessalonike before the projected fiscal census could be carried out. Incidentally, according to John Anagnostes, the Jews too mourned the city's archbishop Symeon when he died in 1429, a fact that points to the latter's tolerant attitude toward them.³⁰⁶

It is not excluded that Thessalonike's Jewish community was somewhat reinforced by immigrants from Negroponte in the first two decades of renewed Ottoman rule. In 1459 Venice requested the return of Jews from that Venetian colony who, it asserted, had fled to Turkish territory because of the plague and had been compelled by the Ottoman authorities to settle in Constantinople.³⁰⁷ On the other hand, emigration must have weakened the community in that same period. According to the seventeenth-century Evliya Çelebi, who apparently had access to a fifteenth-century source presently missing, only fifty Jewish households were deported from Thessalonike to Constantinople-Istanbul.³⁰⁸ This was apparently the entire Jewish population remaining in Thessalonike around 1455 since, as noted above, no Jews were to be found in the city in the following decades.

³⁰³ Mentioned by N. Iorga, "Documents concernant les Grecs et les affaires d'Orient, tirés des registres des notaires de Crète," *RHSEE* 14 (1937): 99.

³⁰⁴ ASV, Senato, Misti, reg. 57, fol. 131r-v, §21. Partial transcription of the clause in Mertzius, *Μνημεία*, 81, note 2.

³⁰⁵ Sathas, *Documents*, 1: 183–85, no. 117; É. A. Zachariadou, "La part des Turcs dans les revenus des colonies latines de Roumanie," in M. Balard et A. Ducellier, eds., *Coloniser au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1995), 349.

³⁰⁶ See above, note 175.

³⁰⁷ Thiriet, *Régestes*, 3: no. 3088. A further reference to former Jewish residents of Negroponte appears in 1462: Valentini, *Acta Albaniae*, 24: 462–63, no. 110t. Significantly, when the *Diegesis* deals with Murad's settlement policy in Thessalonike, in the years following the Turkish occupation of the city in 1430, it refers to Christians and Turks, yet omits Jews: see Vryonis, "The Ottoman Conquest," 301–4.

³⁰⁸ See Lowry, "Portrait of a City," 262–63.

Slaves were a permanent component of Thessalonike's population, yet did not constitute a coherent minority group. Their precise ethnic or geographic origin was concealed in many cases by the Christian names they were given, the spurious ethnic identity ascribed to them, or the references to the places from which they had been brought to Thessalonike.³⁰⁹ Some of them worked in households or were presumably employed in manufacture and local trade.³¹⁰ Others, far more numerous, stayed in the city for short periods only. We have already noted that Thessalonike served as a base for piratical operations, which often entailed the enslavement of captives. In addition, the frequent upheavals in the city's Balkan hinterland resulted in a constant stream of slaves. According to John VI Kantakouzenos, the Byzantines refrained from turning Bulgarian prisoners of war into slaves, Serbs and Bulgarians acting similarly in the wars between themselves.³¹¹ There is, nevertheless, reason to believe that individuals belonging to these nations and Vlachs reached Thessalonike as slaves in the second half of the fourteenth century, as a result of Turkish military operations in the Balkans. The city was an important market and distribution center for slaves, who were shipped to various destinations around the Mediterranean. Sale transactions and documents granting manumission sometimes state Thessalonike as place of origin, yet in fact it merely served as a transit station. Slaves supposedly originating in Thessalonike were sold in Venice, Ragusa, Candia,³¹² Famagusta,³¹³ as well as in Rhodes and other places.³¹⁴ In any event, whether resident or in transit, the slave could not join any minority group existing in Thessalonike.

The investigation of "internal" and "external" foreigners in Thessalonike in the late Byzantine period is a frustrating experience. We know hardly anything about the common foreigners, men and women, who at best have left scanty literary or documentary traces of themselves. The study of foreign groups proves to be somewhat more rewarding. Their relative importance varied over time. The sources bearing on their activity and presence

³⁰⁹ For a case of spurious and concealed identity, see Balard, *Romanie génoise*, 797; Laiou, "Medieval Balkans," 145.

³¹⁰ H. Köpstein, *Zur Sklaverei im ausgehenden Byzanz. Philologisch-historische Untersuchung* (Berlin, 1966), 111–13, finds no evidence for the empire in this respect after the 10th century, yet has not covered all the available documentation. See K.-P. Matschke, "Geldgeschäfte, Handel und Gewerbe in spätbyzantinischen Rechnungsbüchern und in der spätbyzantinischen Wirklichkeit. Ein Beitrag zu den Produktions- und Austauschverhältnissen im byzantinischen Feudalismus," *Jahrbuch für Geschichte des Feudalismus* 3 (1979): 192–93 and note 88. Incidentally, when the despot Constantine Palaiologos, son of Andronikos II, left Constantinople for Thessalonike in the winter of 1321–22, he had with him a slave in charge of his gold and silver table utensils: Nikephoros Gregoras, *Byzantina historia*, ed. L. Schopen and I. Bekker (Bonn, 1829–55), 1: 354.10–13. He was thus not a cook, as stated by Köpstein, *Zur Sklaverei*, 105. For the dating of the journey, see Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*, 290.

³¹¹ See Laiou, "Medieval Balkans," 150.

³¹² Ch. Verlinden, *L'esclavage dans l'Europe médiévale*, vol. 2, *Italie-Colonies italiennes du Levant-Levant latin-Empire byzantin* (Ghent, 1977), 554, 738, 827, 830; S. McKee, ed., *Wills from Late Medieval Crete, 1313–1420* (Washington, D.C., 1998), 1: 240, no. 187: Maria Salonicha, mentioned in the will of a goldsmith living in Candia in 1351 or 1352.

³¹³ A. Lombardo, ed., *Nicola de Boateriis, notaio in Famagosta e Venezia (1355–1365)*, *Fonti per la storia di Venezia*, Sez. III, *Archivi notarili* (Venice, 1973), 54–55 and 80–81, respectively nos. 50 and 76: Andreas de Salonichi, around twelve years old, and Anna de Sallonichi, no age stated, in 1361.

³¹⁴ A. Luttrell, "Slavery at Rhodes: 1306–1440," 93–95, repr. in idem, *Latin Greece*, no. VI: in 1347, 1351, and 1358.

in the city are fragmentary, scattered, and unevenly distributed. The conjunction of both factors results in a gross imbalance in the amount of information regarding each of them.

The evolving commercial function of Thessalonike in the period examined here underlines what should be obvious and is too often forgotten. Geographic conditions create a potential framework for economic activity, yet the latter's nature and volume are determined by the particular historical circumstances and by human action over time. Geopolitical factors and economic incentives largely determined the volume of foreign trade, shipping, and settlement of "external" foreigners in Thessalonike, yet also to some extent the size of Jewish community. We have noted that the restructuring of long-distance trade and maritime networks in the early Palaiologan period resulted in an increasing contraction of Thessalonike's role in trans-Mediterranean commerce and in a growing orientation of the city's economy toward its Balkan hinterland. The intermittent political and economic instability in that region in the fourteenth and in the first decades of the fifteenth century further undercut the city's commercial function and its appeal, as both destination and transit station for traders and prospective settlers. On the other hand, the new geopolitical balance achieved between the major sea powers in the Aegean enabled the Venetians to consolidate their domination in maritime trade with Thessalonike and turned the Genoese into a minor partner in that context.

The Jews and the Venetians are the only foreign groups for which a somewhat coherent long-term view emerges. The presence of the Jews was continuous throughout the centuries we have covered. They were subject to residential segregation under Byzantine rule, and the site of their quarter before 1420 can be more or less determined, yet we do not know anything about their economic pursuits. We are best informed about the Venetians, whose activity and presence in the city were continuous, save for short interruptions due to political circumstances. The number of Venetian settlers and visiting merchants in Thessalonike was higher than that of any other "external" foreign group, Negroponte serving as their main transit station to and from Thessalonike. Moreover, the Venetians were the only foreign group with an official representative of their nation stationed in the city almost continuously, which was the case from the 1270s onward.³¹⁵ Genoese trade in Thessalonike appears to have been more or less continuous, even after the mid-fourteenth century, though on a limited scale and in connection with Chios. In certain periods there were also a few Genoese settlers in Thessalonike. Serbian commerce from the 1370s onward was primarily stimulated by land trade in the Balkans and the exploitation of silver mines in Serbia. Merchants from the Iberian peninsula traded only intermittently in Thessalonike. The Turkish settlers were latecomers in the city, where their establishment was closely linked to specific political events.

On the whole the evidence yields rather disappointing results and raises many questions that remain unanswered. There are no quantitative data enabling an assessment of the size of foreign groups at any moment, nor of their relative importance with respect to the city's population. The sources provide hardly any insights into the economic cooperation and social interaction between the individual members of foreign groups and local inhabitants, or between these groups and the Greek population as a whole. We know of ecclesiastical and popular animosity against the Jews, which occasionally erupted into vi-

³¹⁵ Only one Genoese consul is known to have served in Thessalonike: see above, p. 115.

olence. In the short period of Venetian rule there was some tension between local Greek and Venetian traders and discontent with the behavior of Venetian troops. Yet we are unable to evaluate the impact of foreign groups on the economy of Thessalonike, nor perceive whether they had any impact on the cultural or artistic evolution of the city. It is to be hoped that further exploration of the numerous unpublished notarial documents preserved in western archives will shed more light on these issues.

The Hebrew University, Jerusalem